

# The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1912

## ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

NOTES ON SOPHOCLES, *ICHNEUTAE*, AND *EURYPYLUS*.

### *Ichneutae*.

I. 7 ff. τέχνα[ισιν] is somewhat awkwardly isolated, if it means 'owing to the devices (of the thieves).' The run of the sentence would be improved by the substitution of ἰόντων . . . τεχνά[σματος], and in the preceding line I should prefer ἔπει[ιτ] ἀφρ[ούρων] ἀρπαγῇ]ν ἰχνοσκοπῶ. After τεχνάσματος perhaps ἀλλ' is better than ὥς.

II. 7 If ἐν λόγῳ παρίσταται is correct, as seems probable, it supports τοῖσδε μάρτυς ἐν λόγοις in *Phil.* 319, which has been the object of some suspicion.

II αὐτόχρομα does not mean *forthwith*, and is unsuitable to the context. Probably τὸ χρῆμα, used vaguely as in 17, V. 14, etc., should be restored, with a participle such as πράξας or ἀνύσας preceding and governing it.

14 σπουδῇ, with ἡ πάρεστι πρεσβύτη, qualifies ἐπεσσύθη, and the hyperbaton of τάδε scarcely requires defence.

18 Perhaps: τ[ὸ] γὰρ γέ[ρα]ς μοι κείμενον χρ[υ]σο[σ]τεφέ[ς] | μά[λι]στ' ἐπιστολ[α]ίσι π[ρ]οσθέσθ[αι] χρεώ[ν]. 'Above all, you must see that to your behests is added the golden prize as my secure reward.' χρυσεοστεφέες may have been written, just as some MSS. give χρυσεοστεφάνων in *Pind. Ol.* 8, 1.

III. 20 Surely εἰθ[υ]ντήριε rather than εἰθ[υ]ντήριε was the variant of Aristophanes. For the confusion of εἰθύνω, etc., with ἰθύνω, see *Eur. Hipp.* 1227, *Blomfield on Aesch. Pers.* 779. Recent critics incline to restore εἰθύνω (*Nauck on Aesch. fr.* 200).

NO. CCXXIX. VOL. XXVI.

26 Perhaps rather παντελής, a word used four times by Sophocles (including I. 13), but never by Euripides.

IV. 10 διπλοῦς, with ὁκλάζων following, seems to me preferable to the suggested substitute δίπλους. ὦδε κεκλιμένος in V. 14 and the following lines show that the chorus were on all-fours, and apparently they exaggerated the command of Silenus to bend over the track. For διπλοῦς in this sense cf. *Eur. El.* 492.

IV. 15 Perhaps μὴ [π]ρ[όσω] πά[τει].

18 Presumably there is not room for [ἐλα]ύνομεν.

V. 1 It is incredible to me that ροίβδημ' was applied to the lowing of cattle, as the text of the *editio princeps* requires. The clue is given by the employment elsewhere of ροῖζος and ροίβδησις to express the whistling of shepherds (*Hom. ι* 315) or herdsmen (*Eur. I.A.* 1086). It is true that Monk took the contrary view on the latter passage, where he read ἐν ροιβδήσει βουκολιῶν, but he has failed to persuade subsequent critics, with the exception of Paley. Here we might substitute τῶν [ἔσω] for τῶν [βοῶν]; or, of course, the text might be otherwise modified.

8 In spite of the accent, I should prefer to punctuate after δέδορκεν, and to read αὐτὰ δ' εἶσιδε. The position and emphasis of αὐτὰ are paralleled in *Eur. Hel.* 421 αὐτὰ δ' εἰκῆσαι πάρεστι ναὸς ἐκβολ' οἷς ἀμπίσχομαι.

VI. 12 If the conditions permit, I should much prefer σχήματ' to σώματ'—

mere shapes without substance. Cf. Eur. fr. 25 γέροντες οὐδὲν ἔσμεν ἄλλο πλὴν ψόφος καὶ σχῆμ'. id. fr. 360, 27 μὴ σχήματ' ἄλλως ἐν πόλει πεφυκότα. I cannot find that σῶμα was used contemptuously for *hulk* or *carcase*.

20 Reading αἰχμαῖσιν, I should reduce the stop at the end of the line to a comma or remove it altogether. αἰχμαῖσιν might be equivalent to our 'by the sword,' but is perhaps better rendered 'in battle.' Cf. Eur. fr. 16 λαμπροὶ δ' ἐν αἰχμαῖς Ἀρεος ἐν τε συλλόγοις. Phoen. 1273 αἰχμὴν ἐς μίαν καθέστατον. Soph. Phil. 1307 κακοὺς | ὄντας πρὸς αἰχμὴν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς λόγοις θρασεῖς. See also Wilamowitz on *Her.* 158.

VII. 7 The triple repetition of αὐτός with παρῆναι points to the punctuation γνώσει γάρ, αὐτὸς ἂν παρῆς κτέ.

8 προσβιβῶ λόγῳ is not 'I will urge you on by my voice,' but 'I will win you over by argument.' So προσβιβᾶ λέγων in Ar. Av. 425 and elsewhere. We might render 'I'll persuade you.' Silenus professed that his persuasion would be vocal, but probably the play hinted at something more forcible.

10 I think the right reading is [ἀ]φίστω, which at once explains the genitive οἴμου, and gives an improved sense: *don't turn aside*. The difficult *Trach.* 339 does not help here, except as illustrating the use of βάσιν, for which cf. also *At.* 42 τήνδ' ἐπεμπίπτει βάσιν and Eur. *Hclid.* 802 ἐκβὰς πόδα. But there is another consideration which to my mind is decisive. To stand at the cross-roads, i.e. at a point where the road bifurcates (as explained by Gildersleeve on Pind. *Pyth.* 11. 38 κατ' ἀμυνσιπόρους τριόδους ἐδινήθην, | ὁρθὰν κέλευθον ἰὼν τὸ πρὶν), was a proverbial image typical of hesitation: Theogn. 911 ἐν τριόδῳ δ' ἔστηκα· δὴ εἰσὶ τὸ πρόσθεν ὁδοὶ μοι· | φροντίζω τούτων ἥντιν' ἴω προτέρην. Oppian. *halieut.* 3. 501 εἵκελος ἀνδρὶ | ξείνῳ, ὃς ἐν τριόδοισι πολυτρίπτοις κυρήσας | ἔστη ἐφορμαίνων, κραδίη τε οἱ ἄλλοτε λαίην, | ἄλλοτε δεξιτερὴν ἐπιβάλλεται ἀτραπὸν ἐλθεῖν· | παπταίνει δ' ἐκάτερθε, νόος δὲ οἱ ἥντε κύμα | εἰλείται, μάλα δ' ὄψ' ἐμὴς ὠρέετο βουλῆς. Thus here the meaning is 'hesitate no longer'; and it will be observed how well that agrees with the

use of ἀπενθυνῶ in the following line. The termination of τριζύγης is not more remarkable than e.g. ἀδμήτης in *O.C.* 1321: otherwise τριζυγούς would be the obvious remedy.

VIII. 17 ff. In defence of the suggestion communicated to Dr. Hunt, I would add that μέν' εἰ θέλεις seems to me very much better than μέν' εἰ δύνα, and that its tone 'do please stay' or 'won't you stay?' is exactly suitable to the occasion, if the chorus are now aware that Silenus is rather more frightened than the rest of them. Whether we read δύνα or θέλεις in the next line does not so much matter. The grotesque cowardice of Silenus after his vapourings in VI. 16 ff. may be illustrated by what Nonnus (14. 121) says of the satyrs in general: ἐν δὲ κυδοιμοῖς | πάντες ἀπειλητῆρες αἰεὶ φεύγοντες Ἐννῶ, | νόσφι μόθοιο λέοντες, ἐνὶ πτολέμοις δὲ λαγωοί. The only serious objection to this arrangement is the presence of the paragraphus after IX. 1, indicating a change of speaker at that point. To suppose that this was an error—if indeed it is not excused by the change from lyrics to the speech of the coryphaeus—is a much less violent expedient than the alterations advocated by Wilamowitz. In IX. 2 perhaps rather ὅδ', with τοῖσιν instrumental: 'he won't come out for that: well, then . . .' The speaker turns to address the occupant of the cave, and there is no need to alter εἰ to ἦ in IX. 5. Why τοῖσιν should not be instrumental I do not know: there are several examples in tragedy like *El.* 549 ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ εἰμὶ τοῖς πεπραγμένοις | δύσθυμος or Eur. *Suppl.* 1042 φυλακὰς ἀνῆκα τοῖς παρεστῶσιν κακοῖς. Still bolder is Antiph. 5. 3 ἄπιστοι γενόμενοι τοῖς ἀληθέσιν, αὐτοῖς τούτοις ἀπώλοντο.

IX. 9 ff. is a most puzzling passage. The following are the difficulties in the text as printed: (1) It is unusual for Silenus to be described as δεσπότης of the Satyrs: l. 12 precludes a reference to Dionysus. (2) What were the toils undergone by the Satyrs in order to gratify Silenus? If the service of Dionysus is meant, it is strange to describe it as laborious and irksome. (3) The corruption of εἶχες to εἶπες is improbable. (4) ὑμῖν has no obvious

meaning. (5) I cannot find any evidence elsewhere that the nymphs were daughters of Silenus—or of Dionysus, for that matter. Silenus is often their lover, and that agrees with II. 8. (6) *παίδων* is hardly a necessary correction in any case, but its adoption increases the awkwardness of *δεσπότη* and *ὑμῖν*. The marginal note shows that some doubt was felt concerning the soundness of the text, and its restoration is perhaps impossible. Still, it may be worth while to remark that if we adopt *εὐταζες*, read *ὅς* for *οὗς*, and omit the words from *εἶχες—ὑμῖν ὅς*, all difficulty disappears. Though *ἐγγονος* and *ἐκγονος* are now identified, there was probably also an *ἐγγονος* (*ἐνγονος*) with the sense of *ἐγγενής*, and the relationship of nymphs and satyrs is attested by Hesiod (fr. 129 Goettl.) in Strabo 471. *ποδῶν ὄχλῳ* is a good enough phrase for the dancing rout of the followers of Dionysus. Whether the words *εἶπες*<sup>1</sup> *δεσπότη χάριν φέρων* were introduced as an alternative to *εὐταζες ἀμφὶ τὸν θεόν*, or referred to a description by Silenus of his own exploits, it would be hazardous to speculate.

XI. 9 [*ἄπαν*] *στος* might be suggested in place of [*μέγιστος*].

II [*τύπου*], as the object of *ἐρεῖδει*, would give the required sense. With *τύπους παιδός*, 'his childish mould,' we might compare Eur. *Hclid.* 857 *νέων βραχιόνων* . . . *ἡβητὴν τύπον*, Aesch. *Suppl.* 288 *γυναικείους τύπους*, Soph. *Trach.* 12 *ἀνδρείῳ τύπῳ* (so the MSS). So also Aesch. *Theb.* 475, Eur. *Bacch.* 1331.

14 Instead of *δυσεύρετος* we should expect a word expressing intentional concealment. Since *ἐγκληστῆς* will not serve, perhaps *κατάσχετος*.

XII. 9 The fact that *ὥς* follows *πέφυκεν* (*ἐστὶν* . . . *φυῖν*) in II. 7, 11 makes it at least arguable that it also follows *πέφυκεν* rather than *προσφέρεις* here, and that we should understand: 'is he not then the very image of an ichneumon (*ὡς ἰχνεύμων προσφέρεις*)?' We know too little of the acatalectic tetrameter to condemn the anapaest.

<sup>1</sup> But the *ed. minor* attributes *εἶδες* to the papyrus.

XIV. 12 *ἄκαρπον* can hardly be the attribute of a person. The beginnings of 10 ff. may be supplied thus [*οὐτ' ἐγγενὲς μ]ήτρωσιν* . . . [*σὺ δ' ἄλλος*] (*El.* 1454) *ὅστ' ἐστι* . . . [*καὶ γῆν* (or *ἄγρον τ')* *ἄκαρπον*.

18 f. The order of the words shows that *ἐκ θεῶν* bears the main stress. Then we may accept *ὥς ἐγὼ γελῶ* from the margin: 'will not the gods punish your foolish jests and give me cause for laughter?' She reverts to the thought of l. 13. For *ἐκ θεῶν* cf. fr. 303.

#### *Eurypylus.*

Fr. 3 This fragment seems to belong to a dialogue between Eurypylus and someone (Astyoche?) who is urging him not to go into battle under unfavourable auspices. The indications are *φήμη*, *κράζει*, *ἄλλων ἀκηδής* on the one side, and *ἐδεξάμην*, *ἐπάδει* and *ἔργον δειλόν* on the other.

Fr. 5 I. 8 *ἄκομπ' ἀλοιδόρητα* cannot satisfactorily be combined with the vestiges of l. 10, and I was at one time inclined to think that fr. 768 belonged to another place in the play. But since Plutarch's quotation must have come from the messenger's speech describing the duel, and the very same part of his narrative was comprised in this column, the coincidence is too remarkable to be ignored. *τε* is not essential to Badham's correction (for the asyndeton cf. Eur. *Alc.* 173); and I suggest that *ἄκομπ' ἀλοιδόρητα* should be placed before *δ]ιαβεβλη[μένοι* in l. 8, understanding 'whose enmity was declared without vaunt or boasting.' *διαβάλλω* 'to set at variance'—i.e. to set opposite or apart—is inadequately treated in the lexicons, but cannot be discussed here. The notion of *slander* is secondary, and is often unnecessarily imported by the critics: thus *διαβληθῆς* should not be altered in Eur. *I.A.* 1372. *διαβάλλομαι* is not unlike our 'to come to loggerheads with,' and is usually followed by the dative (Eur. *Hec.* 863, *Hclid.* 422); here, if *ἀλλήλοις* was not expressed, it could doubtless have been supplied from the context.

II. 10 *ἀγχοῦ προσεῖπας* means (I think) 'thy words are near the truth.' Cf. *Ichneut.* XII. 12 *νῦν ἐγγὺς ἔγνων*. *Ant.* 933 *θανάτου τοῦτ' ἐγγυτάτω τοῦπος*

ἀφίκται. Eur. *Her.* 916 οὐκ ἂν τις εἴποι  
μᾶλλον ἢ πεπόνθαμεν (Wilamowitz).

II ἐπισπάσει με: 'will catch me.'  
The metaphor is from a fisherman  
hauling in his line: see fr. 137 and cf.  
Solon fr. 29 περιβαλὼν δ' ἄγραν, ἀγασ-  
θεις οὐκ ἐπέσπασεν μέγα | δίκτυον.  
Since δίκαι here means 'punishment,'  
there is no logical inconsistency in  
reading δίκαι in l. 18. The echoed  
repetition of δαίμων there has rhetorical  
value; and fr. 686 shows that it is  
Sophoclean.

19 f. These lines are unsatisfactory  
for the following reasons: (1) αὐτὸν is  
meaningless, for the order of the words  
is decisive against its connexion with  
τὸν νεκρὸν as *cadaver ipsium*. (2) There  
is no evidence that γέλωτ' ἔχειν τινα  
could be used for γέλῳτα ποιῆσθαι (or  
τίθεσθαι) τινα = 'to make a mock of  
another.' Rather, following the analogy  
of αἰσχύνῃν ἔχειν, θαῦμα ἔχειν, οἰκτον  
ἔχειν, ὀργῇν ἔχειν, φροντίδα ἔχειν, and  
many other examples collected by  
Ellendt s.v. ἔχω p. 293b, we may feel  
confident that Sophocles used γέλωτ'  
ἔχειν simply as a substitute for γέλῳν.  
(3) But the most serious difficulty is  
the use of βία, which can neither be  
combined with βεβᾶσι nor with γέλῳτ'  
ἔχοντες. If joined to the latter, it  
ought to express forced laughter, which  
is exactly the opposite of the real in-  
tention. For the general meaning—to  
add insult to injury—is free from  
doubt: cf. Eur. fr. 1063, 15 καὶ πρὸς  
κακοῖσι τοῦτο δὴ μέγας γέλως. In place  
of αὐτὸν I would suggest ἄδρῳν, for  
which cf. ἄδρῳν γελάσαι, 'to laugh  
loudly,' in Antiphan. fr. 144 (II. 70 K.).  
But what is to be made of βεβᾶσι . . .  
βία? Even if βία were tolerable in  
this conjunction, the emphasis thrown  
upon βεβᾶσι, as if the departure of the  
Argives were the important point, is  
unnatural. The answer shows the  
object of Astyoche's question. Now,  
the Greek thought it fair enough to  
laugh at his enemy's misfortunes  
(*Al.* 79), but felt more compunction in  
trampling on his prostrate form, or in  
spurning or jeering at his corpse. So  
in answer to Agamemnon's οὐ γὰρ  
θανόντι καὶ προσεμβῆναι σε χρή; Ody-  
seus replies μὴ χαῖρ', Ἀτρεΐδῃ, κέρδεσιν  
τοῖς μὴ καλοῖς (*Al.* 1348 f.). Hence the

proverbial ἐπεμβαίνειν κειμένῳ, copiously  
illustrated by Blaydes on Ar. *Nub.* 550.  
That ἐμβαίνειν as well as ἐπεμβαίνειν  
was used appears from Menander's  
μὴ 'μβαίνει δυστυχοῦντι · κοινὴ γὰρ τύχη.  
I hope it may now seem probable that  
ἢ κάμβεβᾶσι (καὶ 'μβεβᾶσι) should be  
read here. Observe how the position of  
'Αργεῖοι, recurring to the verb, justifies  
that of βία. It is unnecessary to  
require τῷ νεκρῷ, for the accusative  
may well be governed by γέλῳτ' ἔχειν  
after the pattern of *O.C.* 223 δέος ἴσχετε  
μηδὲν ὅσ' αὐδῶ (Jebb's n.) or Eur. *Or.*  
1069 ἐν μομφᾷ ἔχω.

24 The suggestion that δάκη τὸς  
should be read involved some such  
restoration of the following words as  
ὁ δὲ τὸ πᾶν ἀσχημόνως | λύμην Ἀχαιῶν  
δὲς τὸσσην ἤσχυμμένως. The deictic use  
of τόσσα, recognised by the schol. on  
*Trach.* 53, does not need defence, but  
that δάκος could be used for a spear-  
wound is, I think, to be inferred from  
Aesch. *Theb.* 386 λόφοι δὲ κώδων τ' οὐ  
δάκνουσ' ἄνευ δορός, and *Cho.* 842 τῷ  
πρόσθεν ἐλκαίνοντι καὶ δεδηγμένῳ. For  
the form cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 2. 53.

III. 12 f. The grammatical difficulty  
might be solved by reading διδόντος,  
if we could suppose that ἀνδρὸς referred  
to Priam. But the contrast implied  
in the juxtaposition of γυναικῶν and  
ἀνδρὸς is not easy to justify, and the  
passage awaits elucidation.

17 This line was probably explained  
by the earlier descriptions of Eurypylus.  
Dr. Hunt rightly observes that παῖδα  
must be 'boy' rather than 'son.' To  
suppose that Eurypylus was still a  
'child at heart' is hardly a Greek idea,  
and it is better to guess that he was  
βοῦπαις, ἀντίπαις—like Achilles in  
fr. 139—or ἀνδρόπαις—like Troilus in  
fr. 562 and Parthenopaeus in Aesch.  
*Theb.* 520. Thus the meaning would  
be: 'one who, while a boy in years,  
was both counsellor and warrior.' Cf.  
Eur. fr. 508, *Paroem.* I. 436.

21 ἐλπίδων σωτηρίαν is exactly like  
ἐλπίδων ἄρωγαί of Orestes in *El.* 858.  
But since τὸ so easily disappears—an  
error which, strangely enough, may be  
illustrated by the same passage—we  
should probably read μεγίστην <τ>.

A. C. PEARSON.



XENOPHON, *OECONOMICUS*, 20. 16

ῥαδίως γὰρ ἀνὴρ εἰς παρὰ τοὺς δέκα διαφέρει τῷ ἐν ᾧ ἔργαζεσθαι, καὶ ἄλλος γε ἀνὴρ διαφέρει τῷ πρὸ τῆς ὥρας ἀπιέναι.

THERE are a number of interpretations of this passage, but none is satisfactory. Emendations also have been suggested. *μή* has been inserted in one or other of the infinitive clauses; Richards (*Xenophon and Others*, p. 13) suggests changing *διαφέρει* in both cases to *διαφθείρει*; and the second *διαφέρει* has been dropped.

In the first place it may be accepted as certain that *ἐν ᾧ ἔργαζεσθαι* means *getting to work in time*, and not *working at the time* (Dakyns), or *working his full time* (Holden, as an alternative). This is settled by the contrast with *πρὸ τῆς ὥρας ἀπιέναι*, and by the fact that the contrast of *working at the time* with *loafing on the job* is given in the next section. The meaning *in time* for *ἐν ᾧ* is common enough (cf. Aristoph. *Peace* 122, *Wasps* 242).

The interpretation of Dakyns, Graux and Jacob, and others is *one man easily surpasses ten*; but, apart from the fact that no parallel is cited for *παρά* with *διαφέρει* instead of the ordinary genitive, it is an absurd exaggeration to say that one man is worth more than ten if he gets to work in time. In the next paragraph the difference between loafing on the job and steady work is said to be in the ratio of one to two, so that an exaggerated statement is quite out of place here. Moreover, we cannot take *διαφέρει* in the second clause to mean *surpasses*, unless we insert *μή* with the infinitive, or make *τοὺς δέκα* its subject (Graux and Jacob, Bolla). Dakyns, here, says *another may as easily fall short*, apparently leaving the *ten men* entirely out of account.

Holden's version is 'for one man in a total of ten easily makes a difference by being at work at the proper time (or working his full time), and another again makes a difference in the united labour by leaving off work before the end of his time.' Against this a number of objections may be raised:

(1) To get a proper parallelism between the clauses, we must, with Richards and Thalheim, insert *μή* before *ἐν ᾧ*. Otherwise what 'makes the difference' is not one man being in time, but the other nine being behind time. While the emendation removes this difficulty, an interpretation that does not require a change of the text will of course be more satisfactory.

(2) *παρὰ τοὺς δέκα* is difficult. In the first place, the words *in a total of ten* come as a surprise. They seem to add very little to the statement that it makes a difference in the work if one man is not in time. And why *ten* rather than a larger or smaller number? If the statement were 'even in as large a gang as ten men it makes a difference if one man is behind time or leaves before the time,' there would be some point in it. It may also be argued that, just as in the following paragraph the contrast is between the overseer who keeps *all* his men at work and the one who lets them loaf, so here the context suggests that the contrast is between the overseer who gets *all* his men to work in time and the one who does not. But, putting these objections aside as inconclusive, it may be seriously doubted whether *παρά* with the accusative could be used in such a sentence as 'one man in a total of ten makes a difference by being behind time.' *διαφέρει*, indeed, inevitably suggests that *παρά* is used in its comparative sense. And, finally, I object even to the article with the numeral in such a context. It does not seem to me that the case can be classed easily under any of the ordinary usages.

(3) *ἄλλος γε ἀνὴρ* is not used naturally. If the meaning is what it is claimed to be, we should expect the simple statement that in a gang of ten men *one* man makes a difference by being behind behind time or leaving before the time. Why this emphasis upon *another* man? In the first clause we have a contrast between the number *one* and the number *ten*; but, if *εἰς ἀνὴρ* is contrasted with *ἄλλος ἀνὴρ*, we either have something corresponding to the late use of *εἰς μὲν* — *ἕτερος δέ*, in which case *εἰς* loses its

numerical value as a contrast to δέκα, or, if εἰς means *one* as opposed to *ten*, then ἄλλος must mean *an additional one*, a *second*. This objection is equally valid against the interpretation 'one man surpasses ten.'

(4) Richards (*l.c.*) objects to translating διαφέρει by *causes a difference*; and, while we may translate οἱ τεκόντες διαφέρουσι by *the parents make the difference* (cf. L. and S.), *i.e.* are *different*, it of course does not follow that we can substitute for this the phrase *cause a difference*. In this connection it will be well to quote the sentences that follow.

(17) τὸ δὲ δὴ εἰάν ῥαδιουργεῖν δι' ὅλης τῆς ἡμέρας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ῥαδίως τὸ ἥμισυ διαφέρει τοῦ ἔργου παντός. (18) ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ὁδοπορίαις παρὰ στάδια διακόσια ἔστιν ὅτε τοῖς ἑκατὸν σταδίοις διήνεγκαν ἀλλήλων ἄνθρωποι τῷ τάχει . . . ὅταν ὁ μὲν πρῶτῳ ἐφ' ὅπερ ὀρμηται, βαδίζων, ὁ δὲ ῥαστώνει κτέ.

The meaning of § 17 is perfectly clear; if there were any doubt about it, it would be removed by the illustration in § 18. We may translate, as Dakyns does, 'to let the fellows take things easily the whole day through will make a difference easily of half in the whole work,' and *make a difference* is here equal to *cause a difference*. Richards, indeed, asserts that 'τὸ ἥμισυ is oddly used. Μέγα, πολύ, τοσοῦτον διαφέρειν are right and regular, but τὸ ἥμισυ is not, and we should expect τῷ ἡμίσει, just as in the fourth case we have τοῖς ἑκατὸν σταδίοις.' Richards, of course, is perfectly correct in claiming that the degree of difference is generally expressed by the dative, but to my mind τὸ ἥμισυ διαφέρει is a perfectly natural development from μέγα or πολὺ διαφέρει. From such a sentence διαφέρει might easily have developed the meaning *causes a difference*, and it would then have had a subject and cognate object. However, it does not seem to have so developed; at any rate, this meaning is not present in § 16, for there we should have an object such as τι, to correspond to τὸ ἥμισυ.

Another construction that could

develop from such a sentence as we have in § 17 would be that τὸ ἥμισυ should be felt as the subject of διαφέρει meaning *there is a difference of one-half*. Such a development we seem to have in ψῆφοι τρεῖς διήνεγκαν τὸ μὴ θανάτου τιμῆσαι Dem. 23. 167. In this case it would be natural that what caused the difference should be expressed by the dative. This is the construction that I find in § 16. ἀνὴρ εἰς παρὰ τοὺς δέκα is the subject of διαφέρει, corresponding to τὸ ἥμισυ in § 17 or τρεῖς ψῆφοι in the Demosthenes passage; ῥαδίως modifies εἰς παρὰ τοὺς δέκα, as it modifies τὸ ἥμισυ in § 17; and τῷ—ἐργάζεσθαι is what causes the difference. εἰς παρὰ τοὺς δέκα is a proportion, meaning *one in ten*, and the whole sentence should be translated 'there is easily a difference of one man in ten by reason of getting to work in time, and a difference of still another by reason of leaving before the time.' That is, in comparison with a gang of ten men that puts in a full day's work, another gang of ten that turns up late does only nine men's work, and, if they quit early, only eight men's work. In this interpretation it is immaterial whether we have a μὴ or not in either of the infinitival clauses; in παρὰ τοὺς δέκα a proper meaning is given both to the παρὰ and the τοὺς; εἰς—ἄλλος is used as we should expect; and ῥαδίως has something to modify. The only objection that can be raised is to the meaning given to ἀνὴρ εἰς διαφέρει, and this, it seems to me, is sufficiently supported by τρεῖς ψῆφοι διήνεγκαν, if the satisfactory meaning given to the whole passage were not in itself a proof of its correctness.

I might, in conclusion, cite the translation of Talbot: 'Il y a la différence de un à dix entre deux hommes, dont l'un emploie bien son temps, et dont l'autre quitte l'ouvrage avant l'heure.' It will be seen that he gives to εἰς παρὰ τοὺς δέκα the same meaning as I have given, though he combines the two clauses in an impossible way.

A. G. LAIRD.

University of Wisconsin.

## BOOK VIII. OF THE ODYSSEY.

IN his fascinating study on the composition of the *Odyssey* (Mnemosyne, XXXIX. 1) van Leeuwen very convincingly argues that the Phaeacian episode in the *Odyssey* is an adaptation of a story in which the Prince (Ulysses) did actually marry the Princess (Nausicaa), the chief part of Book VIII. being derived, with the necessary modifications, from the description of the wedding. This seems quite certain to me, taking into consideration a few points which van Leeuwen does not mention. It is rather surprising that a hot bath is suddenly ordered for Ulysses on the evening of the day following his arrival. If it were meant to refresh him after his fatigue one would have expected them to offer it sooner. The bath is obviously the ceremonial wedding bath (a part of the Athenian ceremony also), and it is remarkable that immediately after it and after his change of raiment he encounters Nausicaa, and they exchange those few brief and pathetic words. This is the proper time for the bride and bridegroom to meet after their ceremonial toilet. We next find Ulysses behaving, as the bridegroom would, rather like a host than a guest and helping Demodocus from the joint (475). The previous games, as van Leeuwen points out, are derived from games held to decide the claims for the Princess's hand, and the serious rival is evidently Euryalus, whose discourtesy to Ulysses is absolutely without other motive.

The adaptation has, on the whole, been skilfully done. In view especially of the fact that Ulysses is not yet to the Phaeacians the personage he is after revealing his identity, but simply an ordinary guest, the rejoicings and the treatment of him as a bridegroom have to be explained by the statement that the Phaeacians live in a constant state of festivity αἰεὶ δ' ἡμῖν δαῖς τε φίλη κιθαρίς τε χοροὶ τε, εἵματα τ' ἐξημοιβὰ λοετρά τε θερμὰ καὶ εὐναί (248-9). The second of these lines has been altered by some modern critics and is indeed rather surprising, if it is not explained as I suggest. The poet of course has, with delightful

naïveté, given himself away by the addition of the last two words καὶ εὐναί. He seems to have been afraid of being betrayed into some reference in his narrative to a part of the wedding celebrations which he had perforce to exclude altogether.

So far I am considering the book as the work of a single author, but just before the above two lines are two which give us pause: οὐ γὰρ πυγμάχοι εἰμὲν ἀμύμονες οὐδὲ παλαισταὶ ἀλλὰ ποσὶ, κ.τ.λ. Alcinous, in proposing the games (100), had said ἀέθλων πειρηθῶμεν πάντων, ὥς χ' ὁ ξείνος ἐνίσπη οἷσι φίλοισιν, οἵκαδε νοστήσας, ὅσσον περιγινόμεθ' ἄλλον πύξ τε παλαισμοσύνη τε, κ.τ.λ. Is it conceivable that the author made Alcinous flatly contradict himself at a distance of only 150 lines?

Again, near the beginning of the book (20) we are told how Athene made Ulysses taller and stouter ὥς κεν . . . ἐκτελέσειεν ἀέθλους πολλοὺς, τοὺς Φαίηκες ἐπειρήσαντ' Ὀδυσῆος. There is absolutely no trace of these many ἀθλα in the description of the games.

That the allusion to them is derived from the original romance is certain enough. The suitor for the Princess's hand would have had to perform certain trials in order to win her; but it is scarcely possible to suppose that the adapter would have left this reference to them unless he meant to adapt the ἀθλα themselves to his narrative. So we are led to the conclusion that his description of the games has been replaced by the one we have. This leads up to the most serious argument against unity of authorship in this book. Everyone, I think, will agree that this lies in the awkward and unconvincing manner in which the situation of line 95—Ulysses weeping at the tale of Troy—is introduced towards the end of the book (521). Ulysses is actually made (492) to beg Demodocus to choose a theme which he knows will again move him to tears. If we had not to deal with the two difficulties I have previously mentioned, I should suppose that in the original version the request of Alcinous to Ulysses to reveal his name (536 ff.)

followed immediately on the first occasion of Ulysses weeping—*i.e.*, that the larger part of the book (96-535), all that is derived from the wedding narrative, is secondary; but the facts force us to the conclusion that the words of Alcinous introducing the games are primary, that the primary description of the games has been replaced by the secondary one we have, and that the words of Alcinous introducing the dance, song, etc. (which, as I say, flatly contradict his former words), and all that follows up to 535 or up to the beginning of Ulysses' story is secondary. We are left to guess how the primary version led up to the revelation of Ulysses' identity. I do not see any other way out of the wood than this, if the difficulties are to be explained without doing violence to the text, unless, indeed we adopt the *bonus dormitat* explanation, which explains anything. I should have been much more pleased if the facts allowed us to suppose that the primary version omitted the games also, but that is not so.

When however I say 'secondary,' I mean something far different from what the term 'interpolated' would convey. I am not sure even that one is justified in distinguishing the different parts as the work of separate persons. The quarry from which their material is hewn is the same—the tale of Nausicaa and her wedding. *A* has no source which is no longer open to *B*, nor has *B* any new source: *A* ignored the part of his original containing the description of the wedding feast; *B* thought it too good to lose, and got it in as far as he could, much to our benefit, priding himself doubtless on his skill in adapting. They must have been nearly contemporary, if not one person. At the time they composed, the original was doubtless known to their audiences also, and very likely *B* responded to a demand. The audience would not be entirely cheated of the wedding, which they knew ought to follow Alcinous' offer of his daughter's hand, and I daresay they felt, as we all, having all of course fallen in love with Nausicaa, have felt, a certain wicked regret that the poet could not go so far as to re-

move the impediment, the admirable Penelope.

I have said nothing of the presents. There must of course have been wedding presents in the original. The presents in the poem are made in two instalments—the gold and raiment in *θ*, and in that part of which I assign to *B*; the bronze tripods in *ν*, after Ulysses has told his story. Both are mentioned later in the poem repeatedly. The poet in *ν* (218) ignores the magic knot of *θ* (445), since Ulysses counts the gold and raiment instead of simply seeing that the knot is intact. This, which was observed by old commentators, is not however a point to be pressed, and it is sufficient to state the facts. *A* may have introduced the presents of gold and raiment in the account of the ἀθλα.

As a corollary to the above it follows that the Demodocus lay, usually regarded as late, is really one of the oldest parts of the Epic. Its subject, the facetious treatment of conjugal matters, shows it to be the actual lay sung at the wedding in Homer's original. There was no reason to adapt it in any way, so it remained as it stood. I do not see why it should not be old. Its poetical value is no criterion of age. Its metrical proverbs give it a rather archaic air, and to condemn it as late because it has the form Ἥλιος, unique in Homer, would be absurd.

It appears to me that (actual interpolations, such as the references to Athens, apart) discrepancies occurring in the Epics may often at least, as is clear in this case, be due to contemporary variations in the treatment of the older material (song, *Mährchen* or legend), which the poems largely use. The attempt to prove by criterions of language, sentiment, and *mise-en-scène* (costume, etc.) that extensive portions of the poems are later than others may be said on the whole to have broken down. If the two poems were composed more or less as they are at one period, it is almost a matter of indifference whether by 'Homer' we mean one poet or more than one.

W. R. PATON.

*Vathy, Samos.*



## THE EXPOSURE OF OEDIPUS.

THE action of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* depends largely upon the rôle of the Theban herdsman, which the poet created by introducing an innovation into the legend of the exposure of Oedipus (L. Campbell, Sophocles, vol. ii. 119; T. D. Goodell, Proc. Amer. Phil. Assn. 39 (1908), XXVIII f.). Instead of making the herdsman expose the child where it might have been found by the Corinthian shepherd,<sup>1</sup> Sophocles endows the herdsman with pity for his master's firstborn, which leads him to give the infant to the servant of Polybus that its life may be saved. I wish to present some reasons for the belief that this innovation was suggested by a passage in the work of the poet's friend Herodotus.

In the first place, in no other of the many Greek legends of the exposure of a child of destiny is the infant's life spared out of pity. This feature, however, is common in the eastern tales of exposure.<sup>2</sup> One of these Oriental legends, the tale of the infancy of Cyrus, was made easily accessible to Sophocles by the Histories of Herodotus, from which the poet gained many suggestions (compare *Electra*, 61 with Hdt. III. 72; 62 with IV. 14, 95; 417 f. with I. 108; 702 with IV. 189; *Oed. Tyr.* 316 f. with IX. 16; 981 f. with VI. 107; 1528 ff. and *Trach.* 1 ff. with I. 32; *Oed. Col.* 337 ff. with II. 35; *Antig.* 712 f. with III. 81; *Philoctetes*, 1207 with VI. 75; 1330 f. with VIII. 143; *Frag.* 429, Nauck, with IV. 64<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> As in Nicolaus of Damascus, F.H.G. iii. 366, and probably in the Aeschylean version (Schneidewin, *Abhandl. d. Gött. Gesellsch.* v. (1852), 180 f.). In the other version, which is also earlier than that of Sophocles, the child is set adrift on the sea in a chest and cast ashore near Sicyon or Corinth (Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 26).

<sup>2</sup> For the Greek myths of exposure, in none of which is the element of pity found, see R. Schubert, *Die Herodoteische Darstellung der Cyrussage*, Breslau, 1890, which should be added to the list of works on parallel myths in Roscher's *Lexikon*, s.v. *Oedipus*, p. 743 f. Schubert also mentions in detail a number of Oriental legends of a similar character, in several of which the child's life is spared because of the pity awakened by its beauty.

Secondly, the parallel between the two stories is striking. In the account given by Herodotus (I. 108-110), Cyrus, born to be the bane of his grandfather, according to the warning of a dream, is given to a trusted officer of Astyages to be put out of the way. Harpagus goes weeping from the royal presence, and instead of slaying the child gives it to a herdsman to expose. The latter is loath to do this, and at last yields to the pleading of his wife who pities the foundling and who has just lost her child, and allows her to bring up the young prince as her own son. In the Sophoclean version of the Oedipus myth the babe, which the oracle has declared will be the slayer of its father, is likewise given to a trusted servant to be put out of the way (1174). Out of pity (1178) the herdsman spares the life of the child and gives it to the Corinthian shepherd, who takes it to Corinth, where it is adopted by the childless wife of Polybus.

There are two details which increase the probability that the poet had in mind the story of Cyrus when he wrote the *Oedipus Tyrannus*: (1) Jocasta tells Oedipus that the child was *exposed* on a 'trackless mountain' (718-19). So in the story of Cyrus's infancy (Hdt. I. 110) Harpagus commands Mithradates, τὸν ἡπίστατο νομάς τε ἐπιτηδεύσας νέμοντα καὶ ὄρεα θηριωδέστατα, to take the infant prince and expose him ἐς τὸ ἐρημότατον τῶν ὄρεων. (2) When the herdsman of Laius tells Oedipus the story, he says that he was commanded to *kill* the child (ὡς ἀναλώσαιμί νιν, 1174). Likewise in Herodotus, I. 108, Astyages commands Harpagus to take the infant to his home and kill it (φέρων δὲ ἐς σεωυτοῦ ἀπόκτεινον).

SAMUEL ELIOT BASSETT.

University of Vermont, Burlington,  
Vermont, U.S.A.

<sup>3</sup> *Antig.* 905-12, cf. Hdt. III., 119, may be added by those who believe, as does the writer, that Sophocles wrote these verses.

## THE JUDICIARY LAW OF LIVIUS DRUSUS.

NOTE ON APPIAN I. 35.

WITH regard to the judiciary law of Livius Drusus in 91 B.C., we have three versions. Velleius states that he restored the courts to the Senate.

Cum senatui priscum restituere cuperet decus, et iudicia ab equitibus ad eum transferre ordinem (Vell. II. 13).

The epitomator of Livy declares that he shared them between the Senate and the equites.

*Epit.* 71: ut . . . senatus causam susceptam tueretur . . . iudiciariam quoque [legem] pertulit ut aequa parte iudicia penes senatum et equestrem ordinem essent.

Appian explains that, though he would have preferred to assign the courts to the Senate, he adopted the compromise of enrolling 300 of the best equites into the Senate, and putting the judicial function into the hands of this enlarged Senate of 600.

I. 35: τῶν βουλευτῶν διὰ τὰς στάσεις τότε ὄντων μόλις ἀμφὶ τοὺς τριακοσίους, ἐτέρους τοσούσδε αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἱππέων ἐσηγέιντο ἀριστίνδην προσκαταλεγήναι, καὶ ἐκ τῶνδε πάντων ἐς τὸ μέλλον εἶναι τὰ δικαστήρια.

Of these versions, the first and third are not wholly inconsistent, as will be obvious, if we remember that Velleius also states, what no one doubts to be correct, that Sulla assigned the courts to the Senate, and yet he had undoubtedly taken the step, assigned by Appian to Drusus, of previously adding 300, if not 600, equites to that body. Unless however we are prepared to bring Velleius and Appian into line by interpreting the former's statement in this way, it seems necessary to reject it, as implying a measure far too reactionary for a situation, in which by all accounts the equestrian order was powerful and influential. Of the versions of Appian and the epitomator, I have always given a preference to the former, as more easy to reconcile with Velleius, as explicitly and circumstantially stated, and perhaps as suggesting to Sulla the course adopted by him. But one of my pupils, Mr.

P. A. Seymour, of Jesus College, has with great acuteness and originality pointed out to me a difficulty in Appian's account, which may prove fatal to its acceptance, at any rate as it stands. According to Appian, Drusus, while constituting the enlarged Senate in whose hands the courts were to be, proposed that the 600 jurors should be made amenable to the charge of judicial corruption, a charge which, though the offence was rampant, had fallen into disuse,

εὐθύνας τε ἐπ' αὐτῶν γίγνεσθαι δωροδοκίας προσέγραψεν, ἐγκλήματος ἴσα δὲ καὶ ἀγνοοιμένου διὰ τὸ ἔθος, τῆς δωροδοκίας ἀνέδην ἐπιπολαζούσης,

and that the equestrian order, in addition to other objections to the scheme, was especially aggrieved at this revival of the charge of judicial corruption, which, as far as they were concerned, they thought had been root and branch got rid of.

ὑπὲρ ἅπαντα δ' ἡγανάκουν ἀναφυσμένου τοῦ τῆς δωροδοκίας ἐγκλήματος, ὃ τέως ἡγεῖντο καρτερῶς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν πρόρριζον ἐσβέσθαι.

As a matter of fact, we know on the authority of Cicero, though Appian clearly both from this passage and from one in Cap. 22 does not accurately understand the point, that there had been ever since the time of G. Gracchus, and was still a law establishing a *quaestio* for cases of judicial corruption, but that, presumably because it was passed earlier than the Lex Acilia, the equestrian order was not bound by it; and it had therefore after the Lex Acilia become obsolete.

*Pro Cluentio* 56. 154; 'ea lege equestrem ordinem non teneri.' Cf. *Pro Rab. Post.* 7. 16, 'in equestrem ordinem quaestionem ferenti: si quis ob rem iudicatam pecuniam cepisset.'

Accordingly, Mr. Seymour argues, as the equestrian jurors had owed their immunity not to mere custom but to membership in an order exempt from

the law, and as the 300 equites, who alone of that order were to have judicial functions in future, were to pass out of that order and to become senators, there is no meaning in Appian's statement that the equites were aggrieved at the revival of a charge which, now that they were to be no longer jurors, could not possibly affect them in any way. In other words, Appian's account is only intelligible on the supposition that there were still to be equestrian jurors, but, unlike their predecessors, amenable to the *ἐγκλημα τῆς δωροδοκίας*. Appian therefore, it would seem, while very explicit as to the compromise being an enlargement of the Senate, mentions objections to the scheme which only become intelligible, if we accept the compromise as described by the epitomator.

To meet this difficulty pointed out by Mr. Seymour, we might be tempted to suggest that Appian really meant or ought to have meant that by transferring the courts to his enlarged Senate, Drusus, *ipso facto* and without any new enactment, brought into renewed operation the obsolete law of Gracchus, and that the 300 equites now to act as senatorial jurors, and not the equestrian order, as Appian says, were complaining that they had been tricked into a responsibility, from which they or their former peers had been free for over thirty years. If we had only Appian to deal with, this explanation might perhaps meet the case, but we are at once brought up by the words of Cicero, who speaks of Drusus as 'in equestrem ordinem quaestionem ferenti.'

This obviously can have no meaning, unless there were still to be jurors belonging to the equestrian order, and unless Drusus was altering and enlarging the scope of the Gracchan law. There is therefore a very strong case for accepting the version of the epitomator, and bringing the law of Drusus into line with the original idea of Tib. Gracchus and the probable proposal of Servilius Caepio.

It seems to me however that we have one alternative, not inconsistent with Cicero's statement, and at least not doing so much violence to Appian as the rejection *in toto* of his account of the compromise. It is possible, prob-

able it seems to me, that the first attempt made by G. Gracchus to deal with the corrupt senatorial courts, [confer Appian's phrase: *ἀδοξούντα ἐπὶ δωροδοκίας*] was the introduction of an *ἐγκλημα τῆς δωροδοκίας*, in the shape of the *quaestio* alluded to by Cicero. This falls very well into line with the law, 'ne de capite civis Romani,' putting a check upon the Senate in another judicial matter, and may have had some connexion with the abortive scheme for adding 600 equites to the Senate (Liv. *Ep.* 60). It is at least clear from the fact of equites not being bound by this law, that the scheme of the Lex Acilia was not yet developed. The corruption law without the projected reformation of the Senate was no doubt insufficient, and the Lex Acilia followed, though, probably from political considerations, the earlier law remained unaltered, and therefore obsolete.

What I wish to suggest with regard to Livius Drusus is that he too, when called upon to remedy the scandalous condition of the equestrian courts, first attempted to stop the corruption by re-enacting the Sempronian law in a form which made it binding upon equites as well as senators, and so, as Cicero says, extended the *quaestio* to the equestrian order. This produced the turmoil among the equites which Appian describes as following upon what was probably a second proposal. For we can easily understand that the equites would be strong enough to wreck the first. What under the circumstances would probably be the second proposal? Surely not the arrangement described by the epitomator, because without an alteration of the corruption law, it would not have met the evil, and with that alteration, would have hit the equites harder than before. I suggest therefore that his second proposal was Appian's compromise, which would bring the Gracchan law again into operation against all jurors, and might, at least so Drusus hoped, satisfy both orders. It was in a way a return to the original design of G. Gracchus by which he had hoped to deal with the judicial difficulty through an enlarged Senate and a stringent law against judicial corruption. The scheme, as we know, was a failure,

and quite possibly the 300 equites may, as suggested above, have raised objections on the ground of the resuscitation of the Sempronian law involved in it, objections which Appian confuses

with the general outcry of the equestrian order against the original proposal to remodel that law.

E. G. HARDY.

*Jesus College, Oxford.*

### HIDDEN QUANTITIES.

PROF. SONNENSCHN's article in the *Classical Review* of May last deals with two separate questions: (1) Should hidden quantities be marked in school books? (2) Are certain specified quantities right or wrong?

1. The Professor fully admits the 'scientific importance' of such quantities; he assumes that the teacher will, as a rule, use them, but he contends they should be left unmarked in school books. 'The learning of hidden quantities,' he writes, 'would in this way be left entirely to the ear, as distinct from the eye, and would be picked up to a certain extent by way of unconscious imitation of the teacher.' This conclusion would seem directly opposed to educational science and experience. There appear to be two reasonable alternatives: either reject hidden quantities altogether and let teacher and pupil alike pronounce all such vowels short, or teach what is considered the correct pronunciation from the beginning and *make it as easy as possible*. To do this the eye must assist the ear. Mark all vowels long which are to be so pronounced, and the pupil has a simple rule which presents no difficulty whatever. But to tell beginners that they are to pronounce as long all vowels so marked, and as short all vowels left unmarked, with the exception of a large number of long vowels which are left unmarked and which they may pick up, if they can, by imitation of the teacher, and then perhaps to have one teacher observing hidden quantities and another not, would be to introduce hopeless confusion.

The fact is that we are in a transition stage. All the older teachers have been trained in one system of pronunciation and do not find it easy to acquire another. But for boys brought up from

the beginning upon the new system, if this is made plain by the pronunciation of every vowel being clearly indicated to eye and ear alike, this difficulty will not exist. As one teacher said in the debate upon Miss Mason's paper, 'I often have difficulties with regard to hidden quantities, but, when in doubt, I ask a boy of twelve or thirteen and he tells me at once.'

The relatively few doubtful cases need not trouble the pupil. The editor of the school grammar must make up his mind to mark them or not, and the boy will not even know that there is a doubt unless his master wishes to tell him so.

The proposal that the teacher should pronounce as long a large number of vowels printed as though they were short would seem to be a quite gratuitous perpetuation of difficulties for future generations.

2. Of the special points raised by Prof. Sonnenschein I only propose to touch on one, the most important viz.: the quantity of vowels before *nf*, *ns*.

Cicero (*Orator*, 48, 159), after giving as examples *insanus*, *infelix*, states without reserve that '*in ceteris omnibus*' a vowel was pronounced as long when followed by *ns* or *nf*. The authority of Quintilian is however quoted to the effect that these vowels only became pronounced as long by compensatory lengthening when the *n* was dropped out. But Quintilian says nothing of the sort, even if we admit the reading in a confessedly corrupt passage. In *Inst. Orat.* 1, 7, 29 he tells us, as is generally recognised, that in the word *consul* the *n* was sometimes dropped out. '*Quid? quae scribuntur aliter quam enuntiantur? Nam et Gaius C littera significatur; . . . nec Gnaeus eam litteram in praenominis nota accipit, quae sonat;*



*te columnam et consules*<sup>1</sup> *exempta n littera legimus.*'

There is nothing here to imply that the vowel was pronounced as short until the *n* disappeared, and not only the evidence of Cicero (*loc. cit.*) but that of Greek transliterations is against this supposition.

To take for example the New Testament, we find Πούδης, Κρήσκης, and κήσος representing *Pudens*, *Crescens*, and *census*. If Prof. Sonnenschein's theory were correct we should have had κήσος or κένσος.

The facts would seem to show that the combinations *nf*, *ns*, tended to lengthen the preceding vowel by nasalisa-

<sup>1</sup> Et clarissimos et consules geminata eadem littera legimus: so a b TF S. Bodl. C. Text as above, NP: *columam et consules* BM.

tion, and that such nasalisation was sometimes accompanied by the dropping out of the *n*. Niedermann (*Latin Phonetics*, p. 30) writes, 'In fact, in the Latin epigraphic records, every kind of vowel occurring before one of the combinations *nf* and *ns* is frequently marked as long by a special sign, the so-called apex;' and again (pp. 85-6), after speaking of the loss of *n*, 'But at an early period etymological considerations caused the restoration of *n*, first in the spelling, and then . . . partially at any rate in the pronunciation. . . . Hence the French *conseil*, *enfant*.'

The actual evidence therefore would seem strongly in favour of *infans*, *cōnsul*, as correct forms.

A. SLOMAN.

Godmanchester.

## NOTES

### PETRONIANA.

(Baehrens, *PLM.* 74-108.)

#### 76.3. The MS. has

mox Phoebus ad ortus  
lustrata deiectus humo.

*Ad ortus* is meaningless. While *ad undas* (Iacobs) gives good sense, *ab ortu* is perhaps simpler: 'after passing over earth from east to west.'

#### 80.5. The MS. gives

cum sonuere tubae, iugulo stat diuite ferrum  
barbara contemnit praelia pannus habet.

Scaliger kept the reading of the MSS., with the exception that he changed *habet* to *hebes*=dull in colour. This meaning of *hebes* is rare and the sense is weak. Baehrens conjectured *barbaricum*: *temptus praeibia pannus habet*. 'The barbarian steel stands in the rich man's throat: despised rags wear amulets that bring safety.' While *praeibia* is probably right, *temptus* is not found. *Tenuis* is equally close to the MS. and gives good sense=poor.

#### 84.4. The MS. gives

Iliadas armatas sollicitare manus.

Lindenberg's *Naiadas* is probably right, but his *armata manu* gives no reasonable sense. Read *alternae . . . manu*, for which cp. Propertius I. 11. 12 *alternae facilis cedere lympa manu*. The present passage will mean 'where I was wont to harass the water-nymphs with alternate stroke,' i.e. by swimming.

I have already suggested this correction in my *Post-Augustan poetry*.

#### 90.5. The MS. gives

sic Phoebea chelys uicto resoluta parentis  
Lucinae tepidis naribus oua fouet.

Petronius is speaking of phenomena that seem contrary to the accepted laws of nature. The passage will mean 'So the tortoise sacred to Phoebus, when it has brought forth its eggs, hatches them with warm nostrils.' For *uicto* Binet read *uinclo*; but *Lucina* does not bind with chains, but brings the young to birth; *nutu* 'by the will of' would seem preferable. Buecheler

would read *noltu*, which would give somewhat similar sense, but rather more obscurely expressed. *Tepidis naribus*, absurd though it seems, has perhaps been unjustly suspected. Neither *roribus* (Baehrens) nor *noctibus* (Buecheler) give sufficiently remarkable sense. The ancients were familiar with the methods employed by the tortoise and turtle for hatching their eggs, (see Pliny and Arist. *H.A.*). But Pliny (*N.H.* 9.37) asserts that some believe that they hatch their eggs *oculis spectandoque*. *Tepidis naribus* may refer to a somewhat similar and scarcely more absurd superstition.

#### 92.8. The MS. gives

et fama est constans fortius ire preces.

Petronius is arguing that men in sorrow seek others plunged in like grief. He proceeds (7) *nos quoque confusis feriemus sidera uerbis*. Binet read *et fama est iunctas*. Baehrens read *sic fama est constans*. In the first case *et*, in the second *constans* is weak. Read *fama est coniunctas*; *coniunctas* abbreviated might easily be corrupted to *constans*, and the *et* was afterwards added *metri gratia*.

H. E. BUTLER.

University College, Gower Street, W.C.

#### JUVENAL.

##### V. 141.

sed tua nunc Mycale pariat licet.

THE editors, of course, agree that *Mycale* (*Mygale*, *Migale*, and *Megale* are other readings) is the name of a slave or *libertina*: whether it is the mistress, or the wife, of Trebius who is so designated is a point upon which they differ. Friedlaender, Wilson, and others accept the suggestion of the gloss (*concubina*)

and explain the whole passage in a way which, among other objections, disregards the force of *nunc*. Mayor, Duff, and others suppose that the wife of Trebius is meant. This is surely preferable, but they give no entirely satisfactory reason for the use of such a name. Is not such a reason to be found in *tamquam habeas tria nomina* (127. Cp. 161)? Is it not natural that the satirist should contemptuously give a slave's name to the wife, when he has just called the husband a slave? *Tanaquil tua* (VI. 566) might be cited as one of the many names applied by Juvenal in much the same fashion.

##### VII. 127-128.

curvatum hastile minatur  
eminus et statua meditaturoelia lusca.

The chief objection to rendering *curvatum* 'crooked' (Duff. Cp. E. H. Sturtevant, A.J.P., Vol. XXXII. 3. p. 325) and *lusca* 'one-eyed' (Friedlaender, Duff, Sturtevant *ibid.*) is that the satirist wishes the statue to suggest the wealth and station to which Aemilius's success as a lawyer is due. For the poet to represent it as being in a sorry condition would, in a measure, defeat his intention that it implies grandeur. But in the following satire (VIII. 4-5),

et Curios iam dimidios umerosque minorem  
Corvinum et Galbam auriculis nasoque carentem,

does not Juvenal to some degree defeat his own intention in precisely the same way? One cannot feel that the descendant of a *noseless Galba* could be very proud of the fact, or that he should be very much inspired by it. In neither case is the poet able to refrain from irrelevant sarcasm.

PAUL NIXON.

Bowdoin College, U.S.A.

## REVIEWS

THE *LYSISTRATA* OF ARISTOPHANES.

*The Lysistrata of Aristophanes.* By B. B. ROGERS. Pp. lii. 247. Bell and Sons, 1911. 10s. 6d.

MR. ROGERS' verse translation of the *Lysistrata* was first published more than thirty years ago. He has now made it uniform with the other plays in his well-known and admirable series by adding introduction, commentary, and full critical notes. When he has re-done the *Clouds*, his series will be, I think, complete.

The *Lysistrata* offers, as every one knows, difficulties of a special kind to the translator. Here more than anywhere we may say of Aristophanes what was written of an Englishman, 'the flesh he lives upon is rank and strong.' These difficulties Mr. Rogers, as was perhaps best, declines to face. One surprising scene goes almost wholly, in others the exact details disappear. Many things that stand unashamed in the Greek are decently clad or put away in the English. The translation has, except in fidelity, all the fine quality to which the translator has accustomed us. The lyrical or semi-lyrical bits are particularly good, the version for instance of 614-705, of which I borrow a few lines as not inapposite just now:

'O these women! give them once a handle  
howsoever small,  
And they'll soon be nought behind us in the  
manliest feats of all.  
Yea, they'll build them fleets and navies, and  
they'll come across the sea—  
Come like Carian Artemisia, fighting in their  
ships with me.  
Or they'll turn their first attention, haply, to  
equestrian fights;  
If they do, I know the issue: there's an end  
of all the knights.  
Well a woman sticks on horseback: look  
around you, see, behold,  
Where on Micon's living frescoes fight the  
Amazons of old!  
Shall we let these wilful women, O my brothers,  
do the same?  
Rather first their necks we'll rivet tightly in  
the pillory frame.'

Mr. Rogers speaks of the great merits of the *Lysistrata* as an animated and,

strange as it may appear, in some parts even elevated play, and his translation, the first in English verse, is worthy of the original. The introduction and notes too are as full of good sense and good taste as ever, and, though he never implies special claim to scholarship, he shows, as he has often shown before, that he can meet scholars on their own ground. He seems certainly right in his distinction between the old women who are told off to hold the acropolis, forming the chorus, and the young ones on the stage. It is also very doubtful, as he urges, whether at the end there can be a Lacedaemonian chorus, for that would mean two choruses, a thing unique and quite different from the two half-choruses that we have in this very play and others. In line 11 I think he is right in taking the sense to be that women are not *πανούργοι*, though most editors take it that they are. The force of *μέν*, which he does not point out, confirms his view. It can only mean that men think so, but that it is not the case. On the other hand I venture to differ on a point or two. In 918, where he gives *τοιούτον* a flattering sense, *so dear to me*, all that precedes shows the meaning to be *so undeserving* (889 *κακοῦ πατρός*, etc.). In 1109 he is probably right in rejecting Bentley's inserted *δειλὴν*, but I think Bentley was probably right too in seeking an antithesis to *δεινὴν*. *Ἀγαθὴν* and *φαύλην*, *σεμνὴν* and *ἀγανὴν*, are certainly pairs, *σεμνὴν* meaning 'high and mighty.' At 705 he makes perhaps too much of the subsequent remark that five days have gone by: that is hardly more than a joke. With the chorus remaining in the orchestra the thing cannot be. When he suggests that Demosthenes took his use of *προυργαίτερος* from 20 and that the phrase *ἔλκειν πάγωνα* originated in 1072, he is surely falling into an error not infrequent and due to the comparative scantiness of our Greek literature, the error of thinking that the first or only instance we have of some word or use must

really have been the first or only, or all but only, one. No doubt these two phrases were quite familiar to the audience, and neither Demosthenes nor anyone else had to take them from our play. I rather wonder that, close observer of Aristophanes as he is, he does not point out how much more dignified and almost tragic is the rhythm of lines 1122 foll., except perhaps 1139-1144. The same thing may be noticed here and there in other plays, when the poet wants for a minute or two to be almost serious. And finally I cannot agree with him in thinking that the famous

despatch ἔρρει τὰ κάλα κ.τ.λ., which he has occasion to quote (1253) was meant to be in two choliambic verses, something like Canning's celebrated despatch in rhyme. Hippocrates' circumstances and state of mind can hardly have inclined him to compose choliambics just then.

Two emendations of Mr. Rogers' own—and he does not often make or approve emendations—may be recorded; 634 αὐτόθεν for αὐτὸ (αὐτός) γάρ, 1053 πόλλ' ἔσω γὰρ κέν' ἔχομεν for ὡς πόλλ' ἔσω 'στιν κάχομεν.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

### THE VITALITY OF PLATONISM AND OTHER ESSAYS.

*The Vitality of Platonism and Other Essays.*

By JAMES ADAM, late Fellow and Senior Tutor of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Edited by his wife, ADELA MARION ADAM. I vol. 8vo. Pp. 242. Cambridge: University Press, 1911. 7s. 6d. net.

It will be a great pleasure to students of Greek philosophy to see in a permanent form these six lectures, most of which they have heard from the author's own lips. All six essays embody views of Greek life and thought that are very familiar to Cambridge students who attended the late Dr. Adam's lectures, or who are in any way acquainted with his studies in Platonism.

The first lecture shows, by the citation of many examples, that theories of Nature and Human Nature are to be found in modern poets like George Herbert, Tennyson, and Wordsworth, which are, verbally, scarcely distinguishable for those of Plato himself—a fact which Dr. Adam expressed by saying that the interpretation of Nature in these poets 'has its philosophical basis, whether consciously or unconsciously, in Platonism.'

The second lecture (published also in *Cambridge Praelections*, 1906) has for its theme the divine origin of the soul, taken as the creed of poets and philosophers from Pindar to Plato. Evidence is adduced from passages of

Pindar, Anaxagoras, the *Memorabilia* of Socrates, Euripides, the Stoics, the *Philebus*, *Timaeus* and *Republic* of Plato, and Aristotle's *de Anima*, to show that in Greek thought it is the higher nature of man, and pre-eminently the discursive νοῦς, that makes him one with the gods, and that spirit or soul, wherever it may be found in the universe, is always regarded as being akin to the divine.

In the paper on the doctrine of the 'Logos' in Heracleitus, a review is given of the various interpretations assigned to the fragments of that author. According to the view of the ancients themselves λόγος meant the cosmic reason that is diffused universally throughout the universe, almost identical with the Stoic λόγος. Of the moderns, Heinze would identify it with 'law' or 'objective reason,' whereas Burnet holds that the Logos doctrine is confined to the Stoics alone, since λόγος in the fragments of Heracleitus means only 'argument.' Dr. Adam decided against these two views on account of the emotional fervour that often accompanies the use of the word in the fragments; besides being the cosmic reason, the λόγος, in his opinion, was also 'the harmony in which all mutually antagonistic tendencies are reconciled,' whence it follows that Heracleitus was more of a prophet and a theologian than a man of science.

In his study of the Hymn of Cle-



anthes, though he allowed for some Semitic influence in the production of the Monotheism and high moral tone of Stoicism, Dr. Adam maintained that both these qualities were already present in Greek philosophy, and that the Semitic influence brought them to maturity. All the characteristic Stoic doctrines—self-realisation, cosmopolitanism, the doctrines of *τόνος* and the *λόγος*, the Stoic solution of the problem of evil—are most thoroughly and clearly expounded in the course of the discussion.

In these four lectures, and also in the fifth on 'Greek Views of Suffering and Evil,' may be found indications of Dr. Adam's view of Platonic interpretation in general. The great myth of the *Timaeus*, for instance, in which others have seen 'philosophy poetised,' he regarded as a poem. In that myth the World-Soul, which God is said to create, is Nature, and Nature is 'man's elder brother, co-operating with him and the Universal Father in one great Trinity of beneficence and love against the stubborn and malignant

forces of Necessity and Chaos' (p. 13). In fact, it was the mystical and religious aspect of Plato's doctrines that Dr. Adam strove to emphasise throughout all his work, believing that 'to Plato philosophy and religion are one and the same thing,' and that 'the Idea of Good in Plato is God.'

The last lecture, 'The Moral and Intellectual Value of Classical Education,' is written in a noble and elevated tone, and merits the serious attention of all who are still asking 'cui bono?' in regard to classical studies. Dr. Adam has shown that the study of the classics provides an education that is in the highest degree liberal by reason of its power, first, to develop intellectual sympathy, and, secondly, to train the moral character. Not merely the sceptics, but the faithful would benefit by reading this able discussion, and the teacher of classics, in particular, will pause and reflect whether his own achievement has been worthy of his high calling.

MARIE V. WILLIAMS.

*Huguenot College, Wellington, Cape Colony.*

### CATALOGUE DES VASES PEINTS DU MUSÉE NATIONAL D'ATHÈNES.

*Catalogue des Vases peints du Musée National d'Athènes.* Supplement par GEORGES NICOLE. Avec un Préface de M. Collignon. Pp. xii. + 352. 8 plates. Album fo., 21 plates. Paris: H. Champion.

THE splendid series of Greek vases now exhibited in the National Museum at Athens consists of three main sections: first, the collection of the Archaeological Society, formerly kept in the Barbakeion; second, the collection once kept at the Ministry of Public Instruction; third, the accessions from year to year accruing to the Greek Government. To archaeologists it is of incomparable importance, both because the find-spots of the vases are in most cases known, and because the vases themselves are distinctive and typical. The old collections formed from excavations in Italy

contained a great proportion of vases made only for export, and conventional in type and subject; although of course many of the most important and original vases which we possess have come from Etruscan tombs. There is a freshness and variety in the vase-rooms at Athens which is very stimulating.

M. Maxime Collignon was the first to attempt a catalogue of the vases in the Barbakeion, published in 1878. It was largely indebted to the inventory of Kumanudes. It contained a few vases of primitive type; but the mass of the vases were of black-figured and red-figured style. A new and greatly enlarged catalogue of these vases together with the other collections which I have mentioned was published by Couve and Collignon in 1902. In it vases of the Troad and the Aegean Islands, and other primitive series, figure largely:

there are however no plates, so that the catalogue cannot be used to much advantage out of Athens.

To this catalogue M. Nicole, a Swiss scholar who has enjoyed the hospitality of the French School of Athens, has now published a large supplement, which the volume of plates renders more useful to foreign archaeologists. The chief series which it comprises are those excavated by Tsountas at Amorgos Siphnos Paros and Syros in 1894-8, the vases from Vaphio, Aphidnae, Thoricus, Salamis and Mycenae. These are mostly of the primitive classes. Of the later series there are many new vases, especially from the very fruitful excavations at Eretria, and from Boeotia.

Among the series not included in the volume, but reserved for separate publication, are the vases from the British excavations at Phylakopi, those from the American excavations at the Heraeum; and the Acropolis fragments which are in course of publication by Dr. Graef and others.

M. Nicole refrains from any historic introduction, which in fact, after the publication of the catalogues of the Louvre and the British Museum, was not called for. He adheres usually in arrangement to the catalogue of Couve and Collignon. All that the reviewer can do is to compare M. Nicole's descriptions with the plates, which reach a rather high order of merit. Cataloguing

is by far the best training for an archaeologist; but a cataloguer who works alone is apt to become rather lax. And it cannot be denied that M. Nicole sometimes is not so accurate as he might be. I must give a few examples. Under No. 870 he does not mention the interesting fact that of the two serpents portrayed one is red and one black. Under 888 he describes as triangles designs which are really quadrangles. Under 889 and 1031 he transposes left and right. Surely it is incorrect to speak of the *bras* of the hydra: it is a serpent body with a head attached. The Eos (or Victory) of No. 1031 carries not a serpent (so M. Nicole) but a taenia. On 928 Thetis is wrongly described as clad in a *short* chiton. I have observed several other slips of the kind. Though I feel bound as a reviewer to mention this shortcoming, I do not think it very seriously detracts from the value of the catalogue, which is generally correct, or diminishes in a great degree our obligation to M. Nicole for carrying through this heavy piece of work, to M. Collignon for fathering it, and to the Société auxiliaire des Sciences et des Arts de Genève for providing the means for publication. The catalogue will be of great value to all students of Greek vases who have the opportunity of visiting Athens, and even to those who have not that privilege.

P. GARDNER.

#### RÖMISCHE SÄKULARPOESIE; NEUE STUDIEN ZU HORAZ' XVI. EPODUS UND VERGIL'S IV. EKLOGE.

*Römische Säkularpoesie; neue Studien zu Horaz' XVI. Epodus und Vergil's IV. Ekloge.* VON R. C. KUKULA. Leipzig und Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1911.

EDITORS of Horace have often pointed out a resemblance between the language used in the XVIth Epode about the Islands of the Blest and that of the IVth Eclogue on the return of the Golden Age. It is the aim of M. Kukula's learned treatise to review all the facts bearing upon this relation, and to determine its precise nature. His conclusions may be thus summarised: Both poems belong

to the year B.C. 40, during the greater part of which Pollio was consul; Horace writes under the stress of the horrors which culminated, for the time, in the Bellum Perusinum (see *Virgil's Messianic Eclogue*, pp. 33-37); Virgil's lines glow with the fresh hope opened up by the Peace of Brundisium. To Horace Octavianus was a hoped-for deliverer, as yet without the power to deliver, and his name is not breathed; to Virgil he is the one certain hope for Italy and mankind, and the Eclogue is an inspired *ὑμνος*. The date is significant, because B.C. 39 had been marked for the

celebration of the *Ludi saeculares*, though no celebration took place until B.C. 17. Hence the Sibylline books would be much in men's thoughts, and Sibylline verses would be flowing into Rome from Alexandria and elsewhere. Kiessling agrees as to the date, but other authorities do not. H. Nettleship, who had given much attention to the Epodes, assigned the XVIth to B.C. 32, and so Torrentius—so also Th. Plüss. In fact, any date before Actium is possible. The Eclogue is fixed to B.C. 40.

With regard to the poems themselves, M. Kukula finds that there has been much misconception. Each should be brought into its own proper class. The Epode is a true Archilochian 'iambus' inspired by poems of Archilochus: the Eclogue is a true 'bucolic,' amoebean in structure, and has its models in Theocritus. To obtain these results a re-reading, or reconstruction, is required, which will be startling to English readers.

The poems must, in the first place at least, be considered separately. It may be convenient to take the Eclogue first. We can afford to be brief, partly because the whole question has so lately been explored in the valuable tripartite volume mentioned above, partly because it will be more satisfactory to state M. Kukula's proposals, with some of the advantages which he claims for them, to await the deliberate opinion of scholars.

The influence upon Virgil's language of the Hebrew prophets, partly at least through Sibylline verses, is common ground to M. Kukula and the English scholars. When we come to the personal bearings of the poem, we have a wide divergence. The English writers agree that the subject is a real human child, whose birth was due in B.C. 40; other explanations, such as that of Sir W. Ramsay, or again, those of M. Reinach or M. Cartault, are ruled out, as Mr. Warde Fowler shows (p. 53 f.), by the four lines which close the Eclogue. Who that child was to be does not concern us now. M. Kukula leaves such questions to a Faculty of Nurses. There was a real child, but he was now a man of

twenty-three; the Eclogue is a hymn in honour of his birth in B.C. 63, and embodies the prophecy of the Sibyl over his cradle, with remarks added by the poet; the glory of Pollio's year is the beginning of Octavianus' reign of peace.

The proposal is this: Remove the four lines which now close the Eclogue, to stand after line 25, where they will form part of the Sibyl's prophetic chant. Thus we have:

1-3, Introduction, by the poet.

4-10, Vaticinium Cumaeum, by the Sibyl.

11-17, Spoken by the poet.

18-25, 60-63, 26-45. Vaticinium continued (divided by periods—childhood 12 lines, youth 11, manhood 9).

46-59, Epilogue by the poet.

(7 lines to the Deliverer, 7 personal to himself).

M. Kukula claims the following advantages (stated here in very brief summary, and without comment).

(1) 'At' in line 18 is explained.

(2) And 'adeo' in line 11.

(3) 'Nascenti' takes a future sense, and 'modo' falls into place with 'fave,' not with the participle.

(4) The Deliverer is, like Hercules and Alexander, to be a deified child of earth, but one deified from birth, not for deeds done.

(5) The 'laugh' is to be a human token for good (as in Catullus 61, 216), but also a sign of a birth more than human. Compare the tearless laughter of the infant Hercules in Theocritus XXIV.

(6) Like Herakliskos (the title-name of the 24th Idyl), and Alexander, Octavianus was a ten-months child.

Any reader who is attracted by these proposals will ask anxiously: 'But how do the four lines come to be at the end in our copies?' M. Kukula does not suggest any accident in transmission: he sees the hand of a falsifier, though the motive is left uncertain. The place of the four lines was deliberately altered, *either* to assist the ambitious schemes of Pollio's son (see the story in 'Servius Dan.' on v. 11) or to favour a Christian hypothesis. The question of probability is here a compound one. Greater probability

on the main proposal will enable us to accept a mere surmise as to the secondary question. Direct evidence as to the latter might go a long way to establish the former. On the whole, something more definite seems to be needed.

A certain amount of direct information may be drawn from ancient commentators. Thus the Berne scholium on l. 37, 'quasi puer esset tum Octavianus, sive non natus esset, ita vaticinatur,' shows an early view that the person glorified was Augustus. Another note in the same scholia (p. 775) 'in hac ecloga solus poeta loquitur' is quoted as proving the existence of a contrary view. We may add Macrobius 3, 7, 1, (quoted by H. Nettleship (*Ancient Lives of V.*, p. 47) in proof of the existence of current views that 'the honour of the poem must be divided between Pollio and Octavianus.'

The XVIth Epode is a spirited poem, in which good judges have found much merit. It should be read in close connexion with Epode VII., and both with Odes I. 14, 'O navis referent.' Theodore Martin gives a translation with a ring of Macaulay's ballad style, and also writes an appreciative notice in Blackwood's *Classics for English Readers*, quoting equally high praise from the first Lord Lytton. It is more to our purpose to quote H. Nettleship (*Essays*, 1885, p. 153):

'The lofty appeal of this poem, the perfection of its narrative, the pathos of its allegorical reminiscence of the story of Phocaea, the rapidity of its hexameter, alternating with the strictest Archilochian iambic, raise it to the very highest rank among compositions of its class.'

The structure of the poem thus understood is simple and Horatian. After fourteen lines of introduction, Archilochian enough, though there is no personal bitterness, the poet dramatises. He is presiding over a debate, and, as Bentley observes, uses the proper formula for putting the question: his own proposal is one of despair. At the end, the speaker is left speaking. Compare Epode XIII., or Odes I. 7, a much more finished work.

M. Kukula is dissatisfied. He takes up a remark of Kiessling's that the Archilochian Epode passes at the end into a true 'elegy.' But that is to surrender Horace's own principle, the 'simplex dumtaxat et unum.' Heine may be sentimental and bitter within the same poem, not so Horace. The proposed remedy is to understand the motion for an exodus to be made, not seriously, but in a spirit of sarcasm.

Like Agamemnon (*Il.* II., 110-141), the mover uses words intended to provoke dissent, not to carry conviction. And the whole tenor resembles that of the famous speech of Camillus against migration to Veii (*Livy* V. 51-54).

It seems impossible to allow that there is any lack of unity in the poem. The term Archilochian is one of vague import, and can only be applied (as M. Kukula observes) in a very modified sense to several of the Epodes which we have. In the Epode before us it may be granted that the language is overwrought, and that there is, as Archbishop Trench, a robust critic, (in his *Plutarch*, p. 65), says, 'a very distinct note of falsetto.' Yet to suppose a long sustained series of sarcasms seems unlike Horace; certainly it is very far from the Horace of the later Satires, whom Persius, in a well-known line, quoted by M. Kukula, describes.

Some specific points of objection to the usual serious interpretation of the Epode must be mentioned:

In the last line 'fuga' is challenged, as carrying associations of cowardice. The author of the *Rhetoric* which bears the name of Dionysius says that *φεύγειν*, purposely used in the Speech of Agamemnon, and *φυγή* always have this colour in Homer. Yet in Latin poetry at any rate 'fuga' with a genitive appears to be the correct and almost colourless way of expressing release from any trouble. Cf. A.P. 31, Sat. II. 6, 95, Epist. I. 18, 24, and also Epist. I. 1, 41, where 'vitium fugere' is an equivalent to 'stultitia caruisse.'

On l. 53 it is argued that 'mirabimur' is a word which could only have attractions for fools. A fragment of Archilochus (76 Bergk) is quoted, where the words *μηδὲς ἔθ' ὑμῶν εἰσορῶν θαυμάζω* occur in close association with prodigies



such as those described in an earlier part of the Epode (l. 30 etc.). This objection is quite valid, as far as it goes, and should be fairly weighed. But it is further contended that Horace would not have used the word seriously, because, twenty years later (Epist. I. 16, 1, etc.) he shews an interest, then newly acquired, in the 'Nil admirari' formula. That 'mirabimur' is the right word in the passage before us, may be seen from Odes III. 25, where Horace compares himself to the rapt Bacchante:

... ut mihi devio  
ripas et vacuum nemus  
mirari libet.

In l. 40 'Etrusca praeter et volate littora,' is usually explained of the beginning of a coasting voyage to Gibraltar and beyond it, where the 'Fortunate Isles' lay. This course would lie for a few miles past the right, or Etruscan, bank of the Tiber, the 'Tuscan amnis' (*Aen.* VIII. 473, *Hor.* S. 2, 3, 33), in view of landmarks such as the 'Tyrrhena pharos' of a later date (*Juv.* XII. 75), and then north. M. Kukula will not have it. He is possessed by fragments of Archilochus (*Bergk* 53-54), which describe the voyage in quest of gold, made northward to Thasos by the Parians, and their disillusionment in finding that 'all the woes of all the Greeks' met there. So the attractive story of Sertorius, preserved by Plutarch, and cited, as from Sallust, by the Pseudo Acron on this passage, must go. The story may have to go, but the 'Fortunate Isles'<sup>1</sup> were early familiar to the Roman public from sailor stories, and Juba, whose book was Pliny's authority (*N.H.* VI. 37), was at this time in Rome, though little more than a child. Later on they were definitely identified with the Canaries. M. Kukula has much to say of Utopian dreams known to Greek writers from Plato onwards, and satirised by them. But there is no proof that these made any impression upon Roman imagination. Surely it is safer here τὰ πρὸς ποσὶ σκοπεῖν.

M. Kukula lays much stress on the imitation by the two Roman poets of their Greek models, by Virgil of Idyls XVI., XVII. of Theocritus, 'hymns' in praise of Hiero and Ptolemy Philadelphus, and of XXIV., the 'Ἡράκλεισκος'. He well points out, as Conington has done in the 'Introductions' of his first and second volumes, that such imitation was no plagiarism, and quotes (from Skutsch, as Conington from Heyne) the very pertinent remarks of Seneca, in the Third *Suasoria* 'fecisse Nasonem quod in multis aliis versibus Vergilii fecerat, non surripiendi causa, sed palam mutuandi, hoc animo ut vellet agnosci.' Thus, to take a single detail, 'silvas' of l. 3 is an intimation that he has Theocritus XVII. 9-12 in mind, and is writing a hymn after his model. So with Horace. If we had entire poems of Archilochus where we have only fragments, a surprising light would be thrown on the Epode before us. The analogy of other poems, of which the Greek source is known to us, makes us feel this to be a little doubtful. Take Odes I. 14, 'O navis referent.' The extant stanzas of Alcaeus, which inspired it, are very instructive on the Greek Alcaic metre; are they equally instructive on the workmanship of Horace? Or again, Odes I. 15, 'Pastor cum traheret' founded, according to Porphyron, on an Ode of Bacchylides, some fine lines of which are preserved by Clement. Now, since 1897, we have the Ode almost entire, but do we know more about Horace? It was finely said by Addison (*Spectator* 417) that Horace 'immediately takes fire at the first hint of any passage in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, and always rises above himself when he has Homer in view.' This is not the passing judgment of a man of letters; it is in harmony with the profound analysis of 'imitation' made independently by two practical ancient critics (see Quintilian, X. 1, and Longinus, sect. XIII.). It can be illustrated from Horace's practice. Odes I. 12, 'Quem virum aut heroa' starts with a Pindaric motive. But having caught the fire from Pindar, Horace lets himself go, and is himself throughout the stirring stanzas. Con-

<sup>1</sup> See Tozer's *History of Ancient Geography*, p. 226.

trast IV. 4, where the poet writes to order an elaborate Pindaric Court poem. Thus we cannot accept either of M. Kukula's concluding tropes. Horace was no gifted 'chess player,' who moved his pieces, that is his borrowed 'motives,' about the board with dazzling results, nor did they fall into their places, without trouble to the author's head, as in a 'kaleidoscope.' To allow this would be to contradict the whole teaching of the three Literary Epistles. A world of toil must be behind any work worthy of the public eye, however easy the apparent movement (Ep. II. 2, 124-125), and however real the genius of the artist (A.P. 408 ff.).

Horace lightly, and half ironically after his wont, compares himself to the

diligent bee. M. Kukula transfers the image to Virgil, and it may well be accepted in the spirit of Bacon's words: 'Apis ratio media est, quae materiam ex floribus tam horti quam agri elicit, sed simul etiam eam propria facultate vertit et digerit.'

We owe to M. Kukula a most careful study of two difficult, and not unimportant, poems, one of which, partly from causes external to itself, has passed, without discredit, among the great literature of the world. It is impossible to do justice, in any summary form, to the elaborate argument. The conclusions can be weighed by any reader familiar with the two poems.

A. O. PRICKARD.

#### THE ROMAN ODES OF HORACE.

*De Horatii quae dicuntur Odis Romanis : Specimen Litterarium Inaugurale quod pro Gradu Doctoratus in Academia Rheno-Trajectina Facultatis Examine submisit Hendrik Wagenvoort, e Pago Minnertsga. Groningae, apud J. B. Wolters MCMXI.*

IN an inaugural address submitted as an exercise for the Degree of Doctor with Classical Honours in the University of Utrecht, Hendrik Wagenvoort discusses at considerable length and with much elaboration of detail the purpose of the first six Odes of the Third Book of the *Odes* of Horace and the relation in which the several members of the group stand to one another.

Dr. Wagenvoort had already treated this subject in a dissertation written in response to a suggestion of the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy at Amsterdam, who proposed as a matter for critical consideration the various views that have been advanced as to the meaning of the several Odes of this group considered separately and the purport of the group regarded as a collective whole.

The sequence of six Odes in the same metre is noteworthy and of itself sug-

gests some close connexion; indeed, the grammarian Diomedes, in his account of Horace's metres, treats them as one continuous poem and numbers Ode VII as II. No such sequence occurs elsewhere in the four Books of the *Odes* of Horace. In one instance (Book II. 13-15) three successive Odes in the same metre are found, and there are besides five pairs (Book I. 16-17, 26-27, 34-35, Book II. 19-20, Book IV. 14-15) of Odes in the same metre—the metre used being, it may be noted, in all instances the Alcaic—but in no case except that under consideration are so many Odes in the same metre placed in juxtaposition. The probability of a unity of general purpose suggested by this external feature is further strengthened by a consideration of the subject-matter of the several Odes. As Wickham says, the ends social, moral, religious, political, which a good government would set before itself in Rome are reviewed, and it is more than once promised that Cæsar's régime is to compass them. This unity of purpose in the whole group Dr. Wagenvoort maintains, and he endeavours to show in detail the train of connexion existing between one Ode and another, and the relevancy of some

of the allusions that have proved matters of dispute. His conclusion is that the subject of the whole cycle is the apotheosis of Augustus, and that its purpose is to justify the act of conferring on a man a title that might be thought to belong rather to a god. This consummation is found in Ode III, where Augustus is represented as admitted to the banquets of the gods.

The general drift of the group being agreed upon, Dr. Wagenvoort chiefly devotes his attention to explaining and showing the relevancy of certain passages that have created difficulty. For example, he considers the following questions among others: To whom are the opening words of the first Ode addressed, and what is their relevancy? Are they an introduction to the first Ode only, or to several of the Odes, or to the whole Book? What is the meaning of Juno's address in Ode III?

As to the opening words of Ode I, the mode of address is suggestive of the mysteries, and, as Wickham observes, seems to include the two ideas that the Odes which follow are to be of a higher mood than their predecessors, and that the wisdom which they convey is strange to the age. The words of Ode II, lines 25-32, revert to the same idea, and if the first and second Odes together be regarded as introductory to the group (the view that Dr. Wagenvoort takes), the opening words of Ode I. 1-4 and the concluding words of Ode II. 25-32 may be regarded as the prologue and the epilogue of the introduction, serving as formulae intended to add weight and dignity to the subject about to be treated. The body of these two Odes emphasises the perishable nature of all things earthly, and dwells on the theme that virtue alone secures immortality—Necessity being the keynote of the former Ode, Virtue of the latter.

After this introduction, Ode III represents Augustus as already admitted to, or about to be admitted to, the ranks of the gods, and the following Odes indicate, though it may be somewhat obscurely, the merits by which he won his elevation.

It is commonly assumed that the prologue is addressed to 'maidens and

boys' as being persons more within the reach of the poet's teaching than the uninitiated crowd of men and women. Dr. Wagenvoort, however, adopts the view that the expression is used by the poet merely to maintain the character of a hierophant already implied by the opening words. The Odes are addressed to the whole Roman people, but the phraseology is adapted to the *Musarum sacerdos* presenting hymns to be sung by a chorus of boys and girls.

The well-known crux as to the meaning of Juno's address in Ode III, lines 17 sq., is discussed at length. It has been suggested that there may be an allusion to a proposed removal of the capital to the neighbourhood of the Troad. This proposal was attributed to Julius Caesar, and was ultimately carried out by Constantine. It has been thought that Horace may here, possibly at the desire of Augustus, be endeavouring to remove from men's minds the fear of such a change. It is doubtful, however, whether this view is correct. It is much more likely that Dr. Wagenvoort—in common with Wickham and others—is right in thinking that the allusion is to Trojan manners, and that Juno in allegorical fashion condemns Asiatic perfidy and luxury. This explains why such stress is laid on the lawlessness and treachery associated with the history of Troy, and helps to mark the contrast with the virtue that opened heaven to Augustus.

The remaining Odes deal with the special forms of virtue that qualified Augustus for the society of the gods. Ode IV tells of the refinement and literary culture the Muses bestowed on him; Ode V dwells on the virtue of valour, and suggests, as is thought, the duty of seeking revenge for the disaster of Charrae; Ode VI deals with religious and social questions, the restoration of temples, the checking of licence.

Dr. Wagenvoort has treated fully and in a judicial spirit the interesting and difficult subject of his thesis. In some cases perhaps he may be accused of pressing the supposed links of connexion too far and with too much subtlety. It must, however, be remembered that if the connecting train of

thought were obvious the subject would not have been proposed for discussion. His method of procedure seems right, namely, first to determine, as far as may be, the general purpose of the whole, and then to use that general purpose as a clue to the discovery of the particular bonds of connexion between the parts. In studying the group one is reminded of the difficulty which a reader of Pindar so often feels in following the thread of that writer's

thoughts. The commentator, no less than the poet, who would tread Pindaric paths must walk with circumspection, and may well bear in mind Horace's warning:

Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari,  
Jule, ceratis ope Daedalea  
Nititur pennis vitreo daturus  
Nomina ponto.

C. H. KEENE.

University College,  
Cork, Ireland.

## SHORT NOTICES

*Retractatio in the Ambrosian and Palatine Recensions of Plautus.* A Study of the Persa, Poenulus, Pseudolus, Stichus and Trinummus. By Cornelia C. Coulter. (Bryn Mawr College Monographs: Monograph Series, vol. X.) Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, U.S.A., 1911.

THIS is a very meritorious performance, and the directors of the Latin Seminary of Bryn Mawr College must be congratulated on it. Plautine study has been so vigorously progressive since Ritschl's day that the previous writings on this subject of 'Retractatio' (the revision and alteration of the plays at the Plautine Revival in Terence's time) have become wholly or in great part antiquated. Most of them appeared before the readings of the Ambrosian Palimpsest were rightly known, and before the Palatine family of MSS. had been thoroughly collated; their statements about the text tradition are therefore woefully inaccurate. Seyffert's and Leo's researches have thrown new light on the form of the ancient editions of Plautus; the discovery of the readings of the lost *Codex Turnebi* has given us a far completer and truer view of the ancient 'Palatine' recension than was possible before; recent grammatical investigation has blunted the edge of Langen's favourite weapon of argument 'this or that construction does not occur in any other passage of Plautus, and therefore cannot be Plautine'; the nature of the Plautine text used by

Nonius Marcellus was not rightly apprehended till the beginning of this century. To bring these antiquated treatises up to date, by a judicious sifting of their collections, as has been done with considerable success in this monograph, is to perform a real service to Plautine study.

The writer confines herself to the five plays, for which we have both the 'Ambrosian' and the 'Palatine' ancient recensions most fully preserved, and tries to show that the former has as much of the 'Revival' elements (*i.e.* of the alterations introduced by stage-managers of the Plautine Revival period) as the latter. It is certainly true that in the 'Poenulus' the 'Revival' elements (or, at least, duplicate versions of lines and passages) are present in the Palimpsest to a great extent. Whether this is true of other plays may be doubted. But it is difficult to arrive at absolute certainty in so delicate an investigation. Only the credulous reader will accept without question a statement like that on p. 113: 'A has eight cases of *retractatio* which P does not give, and P has five which A does not give.' The usefulness of the book lies rather in its sensible and fairly complete collection of the available evidence than in the results arrived at by inference. I say fairly complete, because there are gaps. For instance, the reading of the *Codex Turnebi* in *Persa* 442 has been ignored in the discussion on pp. 31-32.

W. M. LINDSAY.



*Specimina codicum Latinorum Vaticanorum* collegerunt FRANCISCUS EHRLE S.J. et PAULUS LIEBAERT. Vol. I. Large 8vo. Pp. xxxvi+8. Fifty photographs. Bonnae: A. Marcus et E. Weber, 1912.

LESS than twenty years ago palaeography was a science confined to a very few even among advanced scholars, and most schoolboys were as innocent of the meaning of an apparatus criticus as they were of metaphysics. And, I fear, it is with an unregenerate sigh of relief at having been born in those days, and of pity for the younger generation, that most of us regard the announcement of a cheap series of facsimiles illustrating the various departments of Greek and Latin palaeography "in usum scholarum." Whether a system of specialisation in the cradle is likely to be beneficial in any way to the unfortunate youth who is subjected to it may well be doubted; though probably, except in the case of those who would take to it without such assistance and in defiance of authority, one may rely on boys' nature to make it as harmless and as useless as any other kind of school instruction. But all this is merely by the way and does not detract in the least from the utility of the series for students, of whatever age they may be.

Ehrle and Liebaert's specimens, as one would expect from the editors' names, are fully equal to the previous volumes, and higher praise can hardly be accorded them. They comprise excellent representative examples of practically all the main styles of book hand from the fourth century to the fifteenth. As the editors have drawn their material mainly from the Vatican Library, they have naturally reproduced a large number of the early capital and uncial MSS. in which that library is especially rich. One is glad to note that they have chosen in many cases MSS. with cursive marginalia, as the old cursive writing is of great importance for the study of the history of contractions and of the subsequent national hands.

In their introductory remarks they lay stress on these early MSS., suggesting, what is certainly badly required, further research on the history and the

means of dating such hands. It may seem rather a hopeless study after the many attempts that have been made: but the advances that can be effected by such special research is well illustrated by another branch of Italian palaeography, which is well represented in the volume. Not only is what used vaguely to be referred to as the "Lombardic" script now divided into North and South Italian, but in the latter—the Beneventan script—two schools, those of Monte Cassino and of Bari, have been detected.

Northern scripts are rather less fully exemplified, though quite sufficiently: indeed I notice only one serious omission. There is no example of the pointed "Irish" hand, though it was used occasionally even as far south as Bobbio.

The descriptions of the plates are furnished with an useful bibliography, giving the main authorities who have treated of each separate MS., and with transcripts of all the plates which might present any difficulty to beginners.

E. O. WINSTEDT.

#### BRILLANT, *LES SECRÉTAIRES ATHÉNIENS*.

*Les Secrétaires Athéniens*, par M. BRILLANT. (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, fascicule 191.) 1 Vol. Pp. xxi+148. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1911. 4 francs.

THE subject of the Athenian secretaries of state is certainly no new one; that at least is made clear by a glance at the bibliography prefixed to this work. Boeckh, Hille, Schaefer, Wilamowitz and other scholars had studied it before the discovery of the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, and in more recent years Drerup, Pendorff, W. S. Ferguson and A. Mommsen (whose articles in *Philologus* M. Brillant appears to have overlooked) have attempted, with the aid of Aristotle (*Ἀθ. Πολ.* liv.) to solve its difficulties. Yet no agreement has been reached hitherto, and the two discussions which have appeared this last summer, that of M. Brillant and Schulthess' article in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie s.v. γραμματεῖς*, take widely divergent views.

Certainty is perhaps unattainable with the materials at our disposal, but the recent publication by Kirchner of an important list of members and officials of the *βουλή* (*Ath. Mitt.* xxix. 244 ff.) reminds us that these materials are being supplemented from time to time by fresh epigraphical discoveries, and fosters the hope that the future may supply us with definite answers to some at least of our questions.

After an introduction dealing with the Athenian secretaries, in which attention is called to their number and variety and the distinction between the magistrates who bore the title and their *ὑπηρέται* is emphasised, M. Brillant passes on to a careful examination of the text of 'Αθ. Πολ. liv. 3, assuming without question its Aristotelian authorship and taking for granted—rightly, perhaps, but without sufficient examination—its value as our principal authority on the question. Chapter II. is devoted to a discussion of the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* prior to the reform of 368-3 B.C., an elected official who held office for a single prytany and was not a member of the *πρυτανεύουσα φυλή*. In the following chapter the author deals with the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*, an annual magistrate chosen by lot. Here we reach the crux of the whole question. Was this latter official substituted for the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς*, or did the two exist side by side for nearly half a century? The latter view is accepted by the majority of scholars, who point to the continued, though sporadic, appearance of the title *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* in inscriptions down to 318-7 B.C. M. Brillant, however, following and amplifying the theory originally propounded by Boeckh and recently maintained by W. S. Ferguson, seeks to prove that we must 'see in the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* and in the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* one and the same official' and that the use of the former designation after 362 B.C. is really popular and not official, the survival of a title officially discontinued. The author argues with skill as well as conviction and this chapter alone would afford ample justification, if any such were needed, for the publication of his treatise. In chapter IV he states and

supplements the law first formulated by Ferguson for the succession of the secretaries of state, that they follow each other in the official order of the tribes—a law afterwards shown to hold good also for the priests of Asclepius at Athens and for those of Serapis at Delos. The history of the secretaryship is then traced from the time of Aristotle onwards; the three years of oligarchy, 321-319 B.C., were succeeded by a return to the old institutions and the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* resumed in 318 his former place and functions. The author next deals with the other two secretaries mentioned in 'Αθ. Πολ. liv., the *ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους* and the reader (*γραμματεὺς ὁ ἀναγνώσκων τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τῇ βουλῇ*), who in the inscriptions appears as *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου*. Two appendices are devoted to the *ἀντιγραφεῖς* known to us from literary sources and inscriptions and to the secretary of the thesmothetae.

The work is simple and unaffected in style, clear in arrangement, and as interesting as the subject will permit. Errors and misprints, though not entirely absent, seem to be few, and the sources, ancient and modern, have been carefully studied. While finality cannot be claimed for M. Brillant's conclusions, it is safe to say that no student of the Attic secretaries can afford in future to ignore this valuable contribution to our knowledge.

M. N. TOD.

Oriel College, Oxford.

#### OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI.

*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Edited, with translations and notes, by A. S. HUNT, D.Litt. Part VIII., with 7 plates; Part IX., with 6 plates. 1911-12. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Papyracea nuper reperia*. Clarendon Press.

DR. HUNT apologises for the delay in publishing each of these volumes; but those who know will rather admire his speed. It is no light matter to edit a volume of this sort, especially when the literary finds are unusually novel. For we have in these volumes parts of the *Meliambi* of Cercidas, an

author hitherto known by a few fragments; part of the *Ichneutae* of Sophocles, a satyric drama; fragments of the *Eurypylus* of Sophocles, and of another satyric drama by an author unknown; besides the usual theological pieces, and the usual letters and official documents of the Egyptian province. We also owe an apology for delay, but we offer it with confidence, for the delay is simply due to the fact that our *Review* is too small to publish all its reviews promptly, and this fact is due to the fact that English schoolmasters will not do their duty in supporting it. *Tu l'as voulu, George Dandin.*

Cercidas is said in the title (frag. 4) to be a Cynic, *κερκίδα κυνὸς μελίμβοι*: and he uses a lyric metre for satirical matter, a novelty in literature. His dialect is Doric, but not very consistent Doric. He upbraids Zeus for not taking away the wealth of one Xenon, a wastrel, whom he describes by some remarkable compounds; the author is indeed full of strange words, and bearded like a pard (frag. 3, 11). One of these words is the personified *Μεγάδος*, according to W. M.'s clever emendation (suggested by a marginal note). A rather fanciful allegory makes Aphrodite blow soft with the right cheek, and tempestuous with the left. The anonymous satyric drama has some twenty continuous lines, in which the chorus describe their abilities to Oeneus; they claim to understand oracles, medicine, astronomy, and *τῶν κάτω λάλησις*, besides fighting. A fragment of the *Atlantis* of Hellanicus follows, beautifully written; and part of a lion-hunt from Pancrates's *Hadrian and Antinous*, in stilted hexameters. Part of a commentary on *Iliad* ii. is of importance for our knowledge of Aristarchus; another commentary quotes a number of new fragments from several authors. Portions of Bacchylides, Hesiod, Herodotus, Demosthenes, Cicero, and Virgil are included: the last written in square capitals on vellum.

The satyric play of Sophocles has for its plot the exploits of the infant Hermes; Silenus and his satyrs are the trackers who search for the lost cattle of Apollo. The language and

metre of this play are less tragic than the tragedies, but do not show so much licence as the *Cyclops* does. The piece is quite amusing and full of high spirits; one of the cries is novel, *ψ ψ*. The fragments of the *Eurypylus* are so torn that very little can be made of it.

A part of a life of Euripides, by Satyrus, contains authority for some statements commonly made about Euripides, and one or two new items, with some new fragments of his work. It is said that Cleon prosecuted him for impiety.

The extant authors of whom fragments are given here are Euripides, Thucydides, Xenophon, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Apollonius Rhodius.

We cannot examine the other contents of the volumes in detail. Among the theological documents is a passage from the old Latin version of the Bible, mostly new, interesting for both contents and paleography. No. 1081 is from a Gnostic gospel. In Part IX., No. 1166 is Genesis xvi., third century, with some interesting readings; 1172 from the *Shepherd of Hermas*.

The official documents do not, as a rule, call for special notice; but they add details to the picture of Roman Egypt which is now growing before us. It may be worth while to mention leases of a pigeon-house and dining-rooms (1127-9), lease of a stable (1207), temple accounts (1143-4), questions put to the oracle of Sarapis (1148-9, 1213), a Christian prayer and amulets (1150-2), petition concerning an ephebus (1202), petition to a strategus, naming a new prefect, Aelius Publius (1204), a manumission *inter amicos*, the second known (1205), an adoption, the second known (1206). To many the private documents will be the most attractive in this section. A touch like *ἀσπασαι τὰ ἀβάσκαντά μου παιδία*, when we might say 'beloved,' is characteristic: take again *φεδρύνων τὴν πανήγυριν τοῦ νιού μου Γενναδίου καταξίωσον ἅμα ἡμῖν συνδιπνήσαι*: and 'the old cushion in the dining-room.' These trifles often set the writers before us as they lived.

In the third volume of our list, Dr. Hunt collects the fragments of the *Ichneutae* and *Eurypylus*, the *Hypsipyle*, *Cretes* and *Melanippe* of Euri-

pides, and the anonymous satyric play. It was a good idea to make them easily accessible to scholars.

W. H. D. R.

*Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Rylands Library.* I. Literary texts. Edited by A. S. HUNT, Litt. D. With 10 plates. Manchester University Press, 1911.

THIS volume includes 61 papyri, some of considerable length. Amongst them are eleven of Homer, others of Hesiod (Theogony), Herodotus, Demosthenes, Hippocrates, Polybius, and Cicero. In Il. 5. 221 ἐπιβήσεται (found already in Ox. Pap. 223) supports a conjecture of Bentley's. Critical signs occur in 51—the dipole thrice. No. 53 is part of a vellum book which once held the whole *Odyssey*, written about A.D. 300, and therefore of importance for its writing: the accents also present peculiarities, and the text does not fall in with any extant group of MSS. It contains parts of eleven books, and many interesting readings. The writing, though not unpleasing, is not so good as that of Herodotus No. 55, a beautiful upright uncial of the best: this last contains a critical sign →. No. 56 Hippocrates περὶ διαίτης ὀξέων appears to be of the second century, though the treatise is not by Hippocrates. In 57 (Demosthenes, *de Corona*) the contents of the ψηφίσματα and ἀποκρίσεις are omitted; No. 58 has  $\theta$  as a compendium for ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι. No. 59 is a boy's exercise, a phrase six times repeated: a facsimile would have been welcome. The Polybius (60) is part of the same roll as the fragments in Berlin, an excellent text often superior to the extant MSS.: these confirm five conjectures, condemn others, and suggest several new and better readings (xi. 15. 7 insert ἀγομένην after κατάβασιν, 16. 3 . . . προσετώτος, ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ εὐθέως προσέβαλετο. . . . The Cicero is an early crib, the Latin words being arranged in one column with Greek equivalents opposite.

The theological texts are interesting from their age, if little more; but there are a few points worth mentioning. In

Tit. ii. 7 the pap. 5 (third century) has ἀφθονίαν for ἀφθορίαν. No. 6 is the oldest extant copy of the Nicene Creed; No. 7 is an acrostic hymn; No. 12 a certificate of pagan sacrifice, complete.

The rest (13-42) are new classical fragments: they are indeed fragments! The only one complete is an epithalamium of six lines. One is a Maiden's lament (15) of Roman date, restored by Prof. Murray: the lover is a *mirmillo*, and the maiden laments his dangers. A historical fragment (18) mentions Chilon the Ephor of Sparta and King Anaxandrides as putting down tyrannies in Greece. Other bits are from epitomae of Theopompus and the *Odyssey*, writers on astronomy, mythology, and physiology, scholia and lexicon to Homer. No. 28 is a long passage περὶ παλμών μαντική, omens from throbbings or twitchings of the body. It is surprising to find how many parts of the body can twitch!

W. H. D. R.

*Young England's Iliad: prefaced by a camp-fire confabulation among Scouts and Terriers.* By G. N. HESTER. George Allen.

WE have read this unpretending book with real interest. We hardly expected much from it, but there is much in it. The story is told in half-a-dozen pages to each book, but not a point seems to be missed. If anyone wants to appreciate the real meaning of the tale, and the characters it describes, he will do well to get this book; he is likely to find a great deal that he will have missed in his own reading. As a continuous story, although of course it cannot keep the characteristics of Homer, it will be found quite attractive; and we beg heartily to congratulate Mr. Hester. He is worth a library of Dr. Casaubons.

*Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular: Grammar, Texts and Glossary.* By ALBERT THUMB. Translated by S. ANGUS. Edinburgh: Clark. 12s. net.

PROFESSOR THUMB is not quite correct in supposing that this is the first English grammar of vernacular Greek. Mrs.



Gardner's useful little book has been out many years. This is, however, far more complete than its predecessor, and includes a great deal of information on the more important dialects. The specimens of dialect at the end (pp. 285-312) are excellent, and written with care to bring out their phonetic peculiarities. Besides these there are texts (pp. 213-

284) of all kinds of literature, a good glossary (but not English-Greek), and a full bibliography. We need not give a full review of this book, which is already well known to scholars; it is enough to say that the translation is competently done.

W. H. D. R.

## VERSION

### THE SONS OF KING LIR,

WHO, CHANGED INTO WILD SWANS, WANDERED  
FOR A TIME ON 'MOYLE,' THAT IS,  
THE SEA AND  
ESTUARIES OF NORTH ULSTER.

AH, happy is Lir's bright home to-day  
With mirth and music and poet's  
lay;  
But gloomy and cold is his children's  
home,  
For ever tossed on the briny foam.

Our wreathèd feathers are thin and  
light,  
When the wind blows cold through the  
wintry night;  
Yet oft we were robed, long, long  
ago,  
In purple mantles and robes of snow.

On Moyle's bleak current our food and  
wine  
Is sandy sea-weed and bitter brine;  
Yet oft we feasted in days of old,  
And hazel-mead drank from cups of  
gold.

Our beds are rocks in the dripping  
caves;  
Our lullaby song is the roar of the  
waves:  
But soft, rich couches once we pressed,  
And harpers lulled us each night to rest.

Lonely we swim on the billowy main,  
Through frost and snow, through storm  
and rain;  
Alas, for the days, when round us moved  
The chiefs and princes and friends we  
loved.

JOYCE: *Old Irish Ballad.*

### THE SONS OF KING LIR.

QUAM ridet patris illa etiamnum splen-  
dida nostri,  
laeta lyris, vaturn carmine festa  
domus.  
quam profugis sedes tristis, vaga, frigida  
nobis,  
quos iactat canum fluctibus usque  
fretum.

Tenuis ad horrificas brumali flamine  
noctes  
hic nos subtili tegmine pluma foveat;  
at fuerat chlamydeum, fuerat regalibus  
olim  
candidus his membris purpureusque  
decor.

Pro dape, pro vino, borealibus aspera  
harenis  
sufficit alga, siti sufficit acre salum;  
nec tamen aut epulae deerant antiquitus  
isdem,  
aut madidi sorbis aurea pocula meri.

Nunc cubat in saxo somnus, stillantibus  
antris;  
praeludit somno vox malesuada<sup>1</sup>  
maris;  
illa quies molli suffulta in veste iacebat,  
assiduus fidibus venerat ille sopor.

O ubi vos, comites? solis nos volvitur  
undis;  
turbo agit argentem, nix agit, imber agit.  
o, ubi nunc vos, turba ducum, quae  
tempore prisco  
stipabas pueros regis amica cohors?

A. W. V.

<sup>1</sup> I.e., 'male (parum) suadens somnum.' In the context, this seems to be sufficiently clear. *inimica* (somno) and *furibunda* are admissible.

## OBITUARY

## IN MEMORIAM.

THE death of Professor Franz Skutsch, of Breslau University, is the heaviest blow that has fallen on Latin studies in this century. Buecheler and Vahlen were taken from us in their old age when their life-work was practically over, but Skutsch has been cut down at the age of forty-seven. And who can say how many brilliant discoveries, how much re-casting of current theories we have lost by that stroke of fate? Each new number of *Glotta*, the journal which he edited along with Professor Kretschmer, brought from his pen some article which, if not quite epoch-making, at least made a distinct advance in our knowledge of the history of Latin words and their formation. In Etruscan studies too, it was to Skutsch that everyone looked for the final solution of the Etruscan problem, so soon as the publication of all the remains of the language should have been completed. His yearly reports in *Glotta* were the only reliable source of information on the actual progress made year by year in Etruscology.

Skutsch's special field was the history of the Latin language, but his interests covered Latin literature too; and *Glotta* was started with the express design of bridging the gulf between literary and linguistic students. Plautus was his favourite author. His earliest publication, *Plautinische und Romanische Forschungen*, I., contained a proof, a convincing proof (for everything that Skutsch wrote was convincing), that in the everyday language of Plautus' time, before a word beginning with a consonant, *indē* was pronounced as *ind'*, *exindē* as *exind'* (hence *exin*), *ille* as *ill'*, *iste* as *ist'*, and so on. This Phonetic Law of Latin is known as 'Skutsch's Law.' His papers in *Hermes*, *Rheinisches Museum*, and *Glotta* cleared up, once for all, many obscure points in Plautine Prosody and Metre. Loyalty to his old school teacher, C. F. W. Müller, made him accept (perhaps unadvisedly) Müller's denial of Synizesis (*ēos*, *ēorum*, *ēarum*, etc.) in Plautine scansion, and his article on this

subject in the publication *ΓΕΡΑΣ* holds a leading place in Plautine literature. Thanks, in part, to his co-operation, the new Teubner edition of the plays has come as near perfection as we can expect from any text based on the materials now at our disposal. To the ordinary student, perhaps, his two little books on Cornelius Gallus were best known. They launched on a sea of criticism, at first adverse but now mostly favourable, a theory that Gallus, and not the youthful Virgil, was the author of the *Ciris*. They illustrate two sides of Skutsch's personality, on the one hand his amazing erudition and that keenness of intellect which enabled him to pierce to the very heart of a subject, on the other hand his freedom from all personal vanity or irritation towards critics. The truth was the only thing he cared about; whether he himself or another researcher discovered it was immaterial to him; if a truer view than his own was presented to him, he relinquished his own without a murmur. The search for truth was certainly for him at least

Too great for haste, too high for rivalry.

As a University Professor he achieved a wonderful success. Too often German students' dissertations are not worth reading; but this could never be said of the Breslau dissertations of his pupils. They cover a large field, Latin literature from Plautus to Firmicus Maternus (an author edited by Skutsch along with his friend, Professor Kroll of Münster), Plautine prosody and vocabulary, the law of the Clausula in the prose of Cicero, Valerius Maximus, and so on. Skutsch was one of the earliest to see the importance of the Clausula law and to use it, soberly and sensibly, for the determination of obscure points in Latin pronunciation as well as for the emendation of Latin texts. In this, as in many other parts of Latin study, he was in the vanguard, or rather at the head, of the army of research. What shall we do now that our protagonist is gone?

W. M. LINDSAY.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

\* \* Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.

- Aristophanes** (Plutus) Translated into English Verse by the Right Hon. Sir W. R. Kennedy. 9" x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xxii+66. London: John Murray, 1912. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Bassi** (D.) Mitologia Greca e Romana, ad uso delle Scuole e delle Persone colte. Con 97 illustrazioni nel testo e IV. Tavole fuori testo. 8" x 5". Pp. xix+339. Florence: G. C. Sansoni, 1912. Lire 2.80.
- Bennett** (Florence Mary) Religious Cults associated with the Amazons. 9" x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 80. Columbia University Press, 1912. Cloth.
- Bombay Branch of the Classical Association** (Proceedings of the), 1911. 5" x 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 88. Rs. 1.8 net.
- Bradley** (R. N.) Malta and the Mediterranean Race. 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 337. Illustrated. London: Fisher Unwin, 1912. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Bryant** (E. E.) and **Lake** (E. D. C.) An Elementary Greek Grammar. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. 124. Oxford: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Burnham** (J. M.) An old Portuguese Version of the Rule of Benedict. University Studies, Vol. VII., No. 4. 9" x 6". Pp. 78. Cincinnati: University Press, 1912. Cents 75.
- Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius.** Carmina a M. Hauptio Recognita. Seventh edition. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 371. Leipzig: S. Hirtzel, 1912. M. 2.80.
- Cohen** (D.) De magistratibus Aegyptiis externas Lagidarum regni provincias administrantibus. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xii+115. The Hague: L. Levisson, 1912. M. 8.
- Cunliffe** (J. W.) Early English Classical Tragedies. 8" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. c+352. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Der Stil in den bildenden Künsten und Gewerben aller Zeiten**, herausg. von Georg Hirth. I. Serie. Der schöne Mensch in der Kunst aller Zeiten. I. Band. Der schöne Mensch im Altertum, bearbeitet von H. Bulle. 12" x 9". Textband coll. xxxiv and 740. 210 figures in text. Tafeln 320 in portfolio. München and Leipzig: G. Hirth, 1912. Cloth.
- Earle** (M. L.) The Classical Papers of, with a Memoir. 9" x 6". Pp. xxix+298. Columbia University Press; and London: H. Frowde, 1912. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Fenollosa** (E. F.) Epochs of Chinese and Japanese Art. 2 vols. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 8". Pp. xxxvi+204 and xiv+212. London: Heinemann, 1912. Cloth, 36s. net.
- Gelzer** (M.) Die Nobilität der römischen Republik. 9" x 6". Pp. iv+120. Teubner, 1912. M. 3.20; cloth, M. 4.80.
- Greek Literature.** A Series of Lectures delivered at Columbia University. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 316. London: Henry Frowde, 1912. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Griechische Papyri** in Museum zu Giessen. Band I., Heft 3, von E. Kornemann und P. M. Meyer. Urkunden 58-126, mit 3 lichtdrucktafeln und indices. 9" x 12". Pp. 168. Teubner. M. 16.
- Harry** (J. E.) Studies in Sophocles. University Studies, Vol. VII., No. 3. 9" x 6". Pp. 46. Cincinnati: University Press, 1912. Cents 50.
- Hermann** (E.) Griechische Forschungen I.: Die Nebensätze in den griechischen Dialektinschriften. Mit zwei Tafeln. 9" x 6". Pp. viii+346. Teubner, 1912. M. 10; cloth, M. 12.
- Hunt** (A. S.) Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Papyracea, nuper reperta. (Oxford Classical Library.) 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Seven pieces, not paged. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth.
- Jones** (H. S.) Companion to Roman History. 9" x 6". Pp. xii+472. With 80 plates, 65 other illustrations, and 7 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Kern** (O.) Nord-Griechische Skizzen. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 128. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 3.
- Leaf** (W.) Troy: A Study in Homeric Geography. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xvi+402. With maps and plans. London: Macmillan and Co., 1912. Cloth, 12s. net.
- Lehmann-Haupt** (C. F.) Solon of Athens. (Inaugural Lecture.) 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 56. Liverpool: University Press, 1912. 1s.
- Leo** (F.) Plautinische Forschungen: zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie. Zweite Auflage. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. vi+377. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 11.
- Lingua Latina Series.** General Editors: W. H. D. Rouse and S. O. Andrew. (1) Primus Annus, by W. L. Paine and C. L. Mainwaring, pp. 138, 2s. (2) Decem Fabulae Pueris Puellisue Agendae, by same authors and Miss E. Ryle, pp. 94, 1s. 6d. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth.
- Loeb Classical Library.** Terence, Vols. I. and II. (J. Sargeant), pp. 351 and 323. St. Augustine's Confessions, Vol. I. (W. Watts), pp. 471 and 474. The Apostolic Fathers (K. Lake), pp. 409. Philostratus' Life of Apollonius of Tyana, Vols. I. and II. (F. C. Conybeare), pp. 591 and 624. Euripides, Vols. I. and II. (A. S. Way), pp. 611 and 591. Propertius (H. E. Butler), pp. 363. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". London: W. Heinemann, 1912. Cloth, 5s. net each vol. Leather, 6s. 6d.

- Lowe** (W. S.) *The Wars of Greece and Persia: Selections from Herodotus in Attic Greek.* 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 128. Oxford: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Meyer** (E.) *Histoire de l'Antiquité.* Tome Premier. Traduit par M. David. 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii+284. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1912. Fr. 7.50.
- Natursagen:** eine Sammlung Naturdeutender Sagen Märchen, Fabeln, und Legenden, herausgegeben von O. Dähnhardt. IV. Tiersagen. II. Theil von O. Dähnhardt und A. von Löwis von Menar. 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. x+322. Teubner, 1912. M. 8; cloth, M. 10.50.
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri**, IX. A. S. Hunt. Egypt Exploration Fund. 8" x 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii+304. With 6 plates. London: Frowde. Boards.
- Philostratus** (Apollonius of Tyana) Translated by J. S. Phillimore. In 2 vols. 7" x 5". Pp. cxxxviii+141+296. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 7s. net.
- Rand** (E. K.) and **Wilkins** (E. H.) *Dantis Alagherii Operum Latinorum Concordantiae.* 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 578. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Robbins** (F. E.) *The Hexaemeral Literature: A Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis.* (Doctors' Dissertation.) 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 104. University of Chicago Press, 1912.
- Rosebach** (O.) *Castrogiovanni: das alte Henna in Sizilien, nebst einer Untersuchung über griechische und italische Todes- und Frühlingsgötter.* 9" x 6". Pp. 48. Map and 4 plates. Teubner, 1912. M. 2.40.
- Russell** (S. H. J.) *Latin Vocabularies for Preparatory Schools.* 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 55, interleaved. Year Book Press, 1912. Paper boards, 2s.
- Schneider** (G.) *Lesebuch aus Aristoteles mit Erläuterungen.* 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. 83. Leipzig: G. Freytag, 1912. Cloth, M. 1.20.
- Sihler** (E. G.) *C. Julius Caesar, sein leben nach den quellen. Deutsche berichtigte und verbesserte ausgabe.* 9" x 6". Pp. viii+274. Teubner, 1912. M. 6; cloth, M. 8.
- Spearing** (E. M.) *The Elizabethan Translations of Seneca's Tragedies.* 8" x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. x+78. Cambridge: Heffer and Sons, 1912. 2s.
- Stangl** (T.) *Ciceronis Orationum Scholiastae.* Vol. II. *Commentarios continens.* 10" x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 352. Leipzig: G. Freytag; and Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1912. M. 22.
- Tacitus** (Histories) Translated by W. H. Fyfe. In 2 vols. 7" x 5". Pp. 208+245. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Vergil.** *Ex recensione H. Nettleship, a J. P. Postgate relecta.* Edition limited to 500 copies. Vol. II., *Aeneid*, Books V.-XII. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 214. London: Macmillan and Co., and Medici Society, 1912. Boards, £1 11s. 6d. net per set.
- Verrier** (P.) *L'Isochronisme dans le Vers Français.* Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres, XXX. (Université de Paris.) 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 52. Paris: F. Alcan, 1912. Fr. 2.
- Warrack** (J.) *Greek Sculpture.* 100 illustrations, with an Introduction. 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 8". Edinburgh: O. Schulze and Co., 1912. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. Members receive a copy of the annual 'Proceedings' of the Association and of the Year's Work in Classical Studies (both post free). They may also obtain the CLASSICAL REVIEW and CLASSICAL QUARTERLY at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free).

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Mr. J. H. Sleeman, The University, Sheffield, and Mr. M. O. B. Caspari, University College, London; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss M. S. Lilley, Girls' High School, Manchester; Mr. R. W. Reynolds, King Edward's School, Birmingham; Mr. K. Forbes, 135, Chatham Street, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 5, Park Avenue, Mapperley Road, Nottingham; and the Rev. Father Ailinger, S.J., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.